

English in Action

LANGUAGE CONTACT AND LANGUAGE VARIATION



EDITED BY EWA WILLIM

English in Action

**LANGUAGE CONTACT
AND
LANGUAGE VARIATION**

English in Action

LANGUAGE CONTACT
AND
LANGUAGE VARIATION

EDITED BY EWA WILLIM

Kraków 2011

Editorial Council of the Andrzej Frycz Modrzewski Krakow University:
Klemens Budzowski, Maria Kapiszewska, Zbigniew Maciąg, Jacek M. Majchrowski

Reviewer: Dr hab. Elżbieta Chrzanowska-Kluczevska, prof. UJ

Cover design: Oleg Aleksejczuk

Proof-reading: Ewa Willim

ISBN 978-83-7571-170-7

Copyright© by Andrzej Frycz Modrzewski Krakow University
Kraków 2011

All Rights Reserved. No part of this publication or its entirety may be reproduced, transmitted or stored in any manner that allows repeated use in any form by any means, electronic, mechanical, copying, recording or other without the express written permission of copyright owners.



Andrzej Frycz Modrzewski
Krakow University
www.ka.edu.pl

Publisher:
Krakow Society for Education: AFM Publishing House /
Krakowskie Towarzystwo Edukacyjne sp. z o.o. – Oficyna Wydawnicza AFM,
Kraków 2011

Bookshop:
U Frycza
Andrzej Frycz Modrzewski Krakow University
Gustawa Herlinga-Grudzińskiego 1, 30-705 Kraków
phone/fax: (12) 252 45 93
e-mail: ksiegarnia@kte.pl

Technical Lay-out Editor: Oleg Aleksejczuk

Printed by Krakowskie Towarzystwo Edukacyjne sp. z o.o.

CONTENTS

PREFACE	7
---------------	---

PART 1: LANGUAGE CONTACT

Marta Dąbrowska	
Hindi-English Code-Switching as a Community of Practice Marker ..	13
Iwona Krok	
Selected English Borrowings in Popular Contemporary	
Russian Press on the Example of <i>Ogonyok</i>	43
Krzysztof Ozga	
<i>Moya Vayf Yuzaet Vindozu</i> . An Analysis of Selected English	
Borrowings in Standard and Slang Russian	53
Marcin Zabawa	
Is Polish Really Being Flooded with English Borrowings?	
On the influence of English on Written and Spoken Polish	
(With Special Emphasis on the Polish Spoken by Poles Living	
in Great Britain)	69

PART 2: LANGUAGE VARIATION

Jerzy Freundlich	
Americanization of British English: Aspects of Linguistic Change	
in the Speech of Educated British Speakers	89
Marta Ruda	
On the Interactions Between Core Grammar and the Periphery	
in Intralanguage Syntactic Variation. The Case of Missing	
Objects in English	99
Ewa Willim	
Universal Grammar, Parameters of Variation	
and the Morphosyntax of World Englishes	117

NOTES ABOUT AUTHORS	135
---------------------------	-----

PREFACE

The present monographic volume contains seven studies that deal with the ever-changing nature of language. Change and variation are so much at the heart of language that it could well be said that the story of language is the story of continuous invention and re-invention.

The empirical base for the studies included in this monograph is English, which has become the world's leading language spoken around the globe and an essential tool for international economy, sciences, art, and interactions across linguistic, cultural and national boundaries. As a result of its globalization, it is developing new dialects and varieties, and it is coming into contact with more and more languages and cultures all the time. While the lexical (and to a far lesser degree also grammatical) resources of English are readily drawn upon by the languages that English comes into contact with, also the benchmark reference varieties of English are prone to change both from within and as a result of language contact. The influence of social, situational, as well as regional varieties on benchmark varieties of English raise questions about the nature of linguistic variability as well as questions of linguistic norms or standards of nativeness. The studies included in this volume address some of these questions, focusing on two main themes: contact-induced language change and the nature of (morpho)syntactic variability in language. Most of them are based on naturalistic corpus data and/or dictionary-based searches.

The two broad research themes: how English enriches and invigorates the lexical resources of other languages and how it exerts influence on the conversational styles of speakers using English as their second or foreign language, and how the standard or register-neutral varieties of English can be influenced by the contexts of use as well how language variants are born in language, are arranged here into two separate parts, **Part 1** on language contact and **Part 2** on intralinguistic variation.

The topic of language contact in **Part 1** is undertaken in the studies by **Marta Dąbrowska**, **Iwona Krok**, **Krzysztof Ozga** and **Marcin Zabawa**, who address the influence of English on selected aspects of language mixing and language borrowing.

In her richly supported, detailed study of language mixing that can be observed in the posts that native speakers of Hindi, fans of Hindi films and a famous Hindi movie star put on his Facebook walls, **Marta Dąbrowska** not only takes the reader on a journey through time to explain the complicated linguistic situation of present-day India and the status of English in this multi-cultural and multi-linguistic community, but also overviews the debate over code-switching in recent sociolinguistic literature, introduces a formal classification of switches, and looks at their pragmatic values. The main conclusion that she reaches on the basis of a careful, comprehensive analysis of a wealth of data gathered from the Facebook posts addressed to Shah Rukh Khan, is that these switches function mainly as discourse markers, facilitating person-to-person linguistic interaction, especially in its phatic communion aspects, and reflect the communicative strategies characteristic of the community of practice of Indian Facebook users.

The other studies included in this part deal not with language mixing, but with borrowing as a source of greater wealth and a means of invigorating the lexical resources of the languages under scrutiny: Russian and Polish.

Iwona Krok's and **Krzysztof Ozga's** contributions are concerned with the impact that the English language has on contemporary Russian, analyzed on the basis of data gathered from a popular magazine in the case of Iwona Krok's study and (mostly) on a dictionary search in Krzysztof Ozga's inquiry. Both these contributions point out the surprising ease with which the lexical resources of English are used to enrich and invigorate Russian, both standard and non-standard (slang), to fit new ideas and developments as well as to meet the Russian speakers' need for linguistic novelty and expressiveness. In addition, both studies show that borrowing as a process exceeds simple importation of ready-made lexical items into the target language. Once domesticated, English morphemes are recycled over and over again in the Russian lexical morphological component to produce many related native formations, both words and expressions.

Marcin Zabawa's study deals with the influence of English on contemporary Polish. While data from both written and spoken Polish gathered in an Internet-based search are taken into account, the focus is on the types and frequency of English loanwords in the written posts that appear on the Internet message boards used both by Poles living at home and by recent Polish immigrants to Great Britain. As his study shows, English loanwords are used more often in informal written Polish than in spoken Polish, whether the context of use is Poland or Great Britain, with Poles living in Great Britain re-

sorting to English words more often than Poles living at home. Marcin Zaba-wa links this fact to a greater influence of the English vocabulary in a native English setting of language use, Great Britain being the case under study.

The three studies gathered in **Part 2** deal with some of the factors that may be responsible for intralinguistic variation within English. In contrast to traditional dialectological and sociolinguistic variationist studies on English varieties and situational variants, which have mainly concerned themselves with phonological and lexical differences, the three studies included here all deal with (morpho)syntactic variation.

Jerzy Freundlich looks at some selected grammatical changes in the language used by educated native speakers of English that have taken place over the past several decades and traces their origins to the influence of the American variety of English on standard British English. According to him, these influences can be linked to complex socio-cultural factors and the importance of the American variety of English not only on unrelated languages, but also on modern British English. Interestingly, the American signatures on British English are currently exceeding beyond the boundaries of the lexical stock of English, influencing some grammatical resources of educated native speakers of British English.

Marta Ruda looks into the intralinguistic syntactic variation that can be observed with respect to the phenomenon of object drop in the neutral and situationally-bound registers of (British) English, which she investigates in reference mainly to the recipe register. While the observed variation in the availability of the verb's implicit object with specific reference to be left unarticulated has been argued in the theoretical literature to reveal differences in the syntactic systems of the neutral and the recipe registers, Marta Ruda argues for a performance-based view of non-overt objects in such contexts and relates object drop to the general conditions of the economy of linguistic computation that dictate that implicit arguments be pronounced only if necessary for interpretation in their contexts of use.

Finally, **Ewa Willim** explores the morphosyntactic variation observed across the many regional varieties of English and discusses how both the impressive range of syntactic differences across distinct languages and the impressive range of morphosyntactic differences between the standard and non-standard varieties of English can be approached and explained in the Chomskyan perspective of language, which takes the properties of the module of the human cognitive system that is dedicated to language to be shaped both by some universal mechanisms and features common to all individual languages and by some features that are left underspecified and thus a source of linguistic variability. In this perspective, linguistic variation is a result of the idiosyncratic differences in the ways in which the universal set of grammatical features can be realized across languages and within individ-

ual languages. Underspecification can be argued to result in the emergence of variants, each of which may be associated with a host of usage-related factors, such as sociolinguistic connotations, ease of access and judgments of appropriateness. While on the face of it language variation is impressive, it is neither without limits nor unpredictable, contrary to the traditional stance on this issue in typological and variationist linguistics.

The ideas presented in this volume will hopefully provoke interesting questions and inspire further research.

E.W.

Part 1

LANGUAGE CONTACT

Marta Dąbrowska

Jagiellonian University in Krakow

HINDI-ENGLISH CODE-SWITCHING AS A COMMUNITY OF PRACTICE MARKER

STRESZCZENIE

Poniższa analiza dotyczy zjawiska przełączania kodów, charakteryzującego strategię komunikacyjne użytkowników i wspólnot dwujęzycznych. Zjawisko to omawiane jest w oparciu o język mediów elektronicznych (na przykładzie portalu społecznościowego Facebook) jako wyznacznik tzw. wspólnot działania. Studium przedstawia pokrótce historię oraz typologię badań nad zjawiskiem przełączania kodów pod względem jego formy gramatycznej oraz pełnionych przez to zjawisko funkcji, omawia także podobieństwa i różnice pomiędzy przełączaniem kodów a zapożyczeniami językowymi. Część analityczna obejmuje klasyfikację postów pisanych z wykorzystaniem przełączania kodów pomiędzy językiem hindi a językiem angielskim, zebranych na jednej ze stron poświęconych znanemu aktorowi kina indyjskiego, na grupy przełączeń pozazdaniowych, międzyzdaniowych oraz wewnątrz zdaniowych, przedstawia także omówienie zebranych przykładów pod względem ich struktury gramatycznej, poprawności, oraz funkcji elementów wyrażonych w języku angielskim i w hindi.

1. INTRODUCTION

The phenomenon of code-switching (CS) is much more widespread in our everyday life than users of languages realize. It may appear in any facet of speech, be it language, dialect, register or style. For instance, any time we wish to greet a person we do not know, we choose a more formal style of communication than when we greet our best friend. Thus, we will code-switch between different styles. This is what each of us experiences in our everyday existence. Not everyone, however, has a chance to code-switch be-

tween different dialects, not to mention different languages, as this requires at least a minimum degree of bidialectalism or bilingualism (cf. Macnamara 1967, Hamers and Blanc 1989). This level of code-switching is therefore limited to only a certain percentage of speakers in a country like, e.g., Poland, which is officially monolingual, with only one language recognized nationally. Most countries in the world, however, are formally acknowledged to be bi- or even multilingual states (Wardhaugh 1991, Trudgill 1995), and in consequence a certain proportion of members of those societies will under certain circumstances make use of more than one language system. Depending on the context in which the users of those languages find themselves, they will select one or the other language. Yet, as practice very often shows, it is not uncommon for the two languages to be used in one stretch of conversation. Such a situation could be better described as code-mixing (Wardhaugh 1991). This is certainly the case in a country like India, which is one of the most multilingual countries in the world. The speech behavior of Indian Facebook users in particular will be the focus of analysis in this article.

2. AN OVERVIEW OF CODE-SWITCHING STUDIES

Code-switching was first recognized as a linguistic phenomenon worth a systematic description in the 1970s. The first meaningful discussion was offered by Blom and Gumperz (1972) following their observations in the village of Hemnesberget in Norway. Having observed the context in which the local inhabitants chose to speak Bokmål as opposed to Ranamål, the researchers suggested the now well-known division of CS into *situational code-switching* (depending on the situational context of interaction), *metaphorical code-switching* (in which the topic itself decides which code is most appropriate to discuss said topic in) as well as *conversational code-switching*, otherwise known as *code-mixing*. Trudgill (2003: 23) states that code-mixing is a “process whereby speakers indulge in code-switching between languages of such rapidity and density, even within sentences and phrases, that it is not really possible to say at any given time which language they are speaking.”

What followed were studies whose major aims could be divided into two main categories: firstly, the discussion of the grammatical structure of the code-switched phrases, and what follows, the analysis of any structural constraints determining the possibility for certain elements to be switched between two given languages, and secondly, the social factors motivating the switching between two linguistic codes. The most widely recognized studies of the structural aspect of the phenomenon are the papers by Myers-Scotton (1993b, 1995, 2002a, 2009), the author of the Matrix Language Frame (1993b, 2002a), a model which distinguishes between the so-called Matrix Language, i.e., the language which provides the underlying gram-

mathematical structure of the conversational turn, and the Embedded Language, i.e., the one which is inserted into the Matrix Language context. Other researchers have approached the phenomenon differently. One of the first to analyze the aspect of the structure of switches was Poplack (1980), who argued that switches may occur only at places where the Matrix Language and the Embedded Language are equivalent in terms of their structure. Poplack (1980, 1981) also introduced the basic typology of switches in terms of the place where they occur in the sentence, i.e., extra-sentential switches (those which appear in the form of question tags or elements which are not an integral part of a sentence), intersentential switches (which occur between sentences), and finally intrasentential switches (i.e., those which take place within a sentence between its particular components), the last-named typically being a feature of the above-mentioned code-mixing. Additionally, in recent years some linguists (cf. Jake et al. 2002, 2005, MacSwan 2005) have also applied a Chomskyan generative approach to the study of the code-switching structure, specifically the Minimalist Program, which refers to Chomsky's E-language (i.e., the totality of utterances which can be made in a given community) and I-grammar (i.e., the grammar of a particular speaker) (cf. Gardner-Chloros 2009: 93). In these approaches, the analysis of a code-switched utterance will not be different from the analysis of the monolingual text at the deep structure, however, at the same time CS grammar is considered impure, as it does not rely on a single set of choices allowed by the Universal Grammar.

An alternative aspect of study, as mentioned above, is the motivation of the speakers for performing switches. As in the case of the previous aspect, it is the work of Myers-Scotton (1993a), based mainly on English-Swahili CS in Kenya, Nigeria and others, which has won the greatest recognition in the field. Myers-Scotton (1983, 1993a, 2002a) introduced the so-called Markedness Model, which evaluates the social context of the switches, thereby making it possible to state in which situation the switches are expected (i.e., unmarked) in the multilingual context, and in which they are unexpected (i.e., marked) and thus carry some special meaning. Myers-Scotton (1993a) distinguished four types of switches, i.e., unmarked switches, a series of unmarked switches, marked switches, and exploratory switches. Her assumption was also that no switches were always marked or unmarked, but they depended on the context and the speaker's previous experience (Myers-Scotton 2009). Apart from Myers-Scotton, the social aspect has also featured quite markedly in the works of Gardner-Chloros (1991, 1995, 2009), McClure and McClure (1988), Sebba and Wootton (1998) and a number of others. An especially interesting development is to link the concept of CS with linguistic styles, especially with the idea of the community of practice (Eckert and McConnell-Ginet 1992, Eckert 2000) indicated in the title of this paper, whereby bilingual discourse practices may be analyzed, as will be discussed below.

Somewhat in opposition to the analysis of CS with regard to the social factors describing a given community, some linguists have interpreted the phenomenon within the theory of Conversational Analysis. This is in keeping with the belief that switches should be interpreted better within conversation, which is an orderly phenomenon, rather than by reference to social norms governing a given community (cf. Gafaranga 2005, Gardner-Chloros 2009). When analyzing conversational turns it is often hard to specify what language choices are to be made, and the decisions are taken on the basis of the choices of other interlocutors. The societal structures do, of course, have a bearing on the evaluation of the overall situation, as much as grammatical constraints do, but what is more important are the conversational practices of a given community (cf. Auer 1984, 1998, Li Wei 1998).

Out of this broad plethora of analytical options, the community of practice approach appears to be most applicable to the analysis of the material collected by me in the context of Computer-Mediated Communication, and more specifically via the Facebook social network. However, at the same time I do recognize a need to place the study more firmly within the social context from which most of the post authors come, and by which they have been shaped, that being the multilingual society of India.

3. HISTORY OF ENGLISH IN INDIA

India has been an independent state since 1947, the year in which the rule of the British Raj ended after almost 90 years. The first contact between Britain and India, which was then more of a conglomeration of smaller kingdoms in the hands of local rulers covering the area of present-day India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, and Ceylon (now Sri Lanka), was formally made in 1600 when the East India Company was established in Calcutta (and which effectively ruled the area for more than 200 years) (Baugh and Cable 2002, Crystal 2005). The competition against France, the primary rival of Britain on the Indian sub-continent in terms of trade, gradually led to the subjugation of most parts of the area, aided by military actions. Finally, the Crown took possession of that part of the world in 1858 after India's First War of Independence (1857), and ruled the lands directly or through local rulers in the so-called Native States (Crystal 2005). In 1876 a union was signed, as a result of which the existence of the Indian Empire was proclaimed.

Thus, India at its very outset was a state comprising numerous language and dialect groups which can be broadly divided into the Indo-European Northern Belt, and the Dravidian South, with a minor representation of two other groups on the fringes. With the progression of British rule in India the English language was naturally transplanted to the region as well, and used in education almost from the beginning of the British Raj, i.e., from the time

of the acceptance of a Minute written by Thomas Macaulay in 1835, which introduced the English educational system in India (Crystal 2005: 443), although it needs to be added that in 1854, under Charles Wood, the President of the Board of Control (who spread education far and wide and established a number of universities on the model of the University of London in Bombay, Calcutta, Madras and Allahabad) the native inhabitants of India were also granted the right to receive education in their native tongues. The English language was, obviously, the language of the elite; its use was also spread by white missionaries in their attempts to convert the local population to Christianity as well as propagate European culture (cf. Kachru 1992). Thus, the status of English was very firm throughout the period, and, although the British Raj was brought to an end in 1947, forcing the British to leave India, the language, in spite of hostile attitudes towards the colonizers, remained. Following the Indian Constitution of 1950 it was believed that English would assist communication within the newly-formed multilingual states for 15 years after independence, upon which Hindi, the most widespread language of the North, would gradually take over the function of the official national language (Baugh and Cable 2002). This, however, did not become reality. A strong resistance to the use of Hindi in the Southern, Dravidian-speaking states (as Southerners did not see any similar propagation of a Dravidian language across the Northern Belt (cf. Das Gupta 1970)) ultimately led to the Official Language Bill of 1963, which stated that English was to remain as an assistant language side by side with Hindi (Dwivendi 1981), together with the local tongues officially used in various Indian states (currently, these number 22 official state languages including English). As in some other post-colonial countries, namely Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania, Singapore and others, English has remained a neutral means of communication. This has been perceived as a better solution in the context of local tribal rivalry for recognition, since the selection of one native tongue as an official language as opposed to others would no doubt cause dispute (cf. Baugh and Cable 2002, Mesthrie 2000, Gardner-Chloros and Charles 2007).

4. THE POSITION OF ENGLISH IN THE OUTER CIRCLE

As this brief historical outline has demonstrated, English has always enjoyed high prestige in India. At this point it is counted among the group of the so-called New Englishes, i.e., languages indigenized and nativized through exposure to local tongues, which are an important medium of inter-group communication (cf. Mesthrie 2000); they are also used in the official context, i.e., the parliament, courts, education and the media (cf. also Jenkins 2009). New Englishes are, however, mostly second languages, next to local languages and dialects, which are taught in school right at the beginning of a child's

education, although in fact some percentage of the local population, mainly the elites, may use English at home as a language of primary communication and socialization (cf. Jenkins 2009). What no doubt strengthens the position of English round the world, and naturally also in the post-colonial states, is the fact that English has become an internationally-recognized lingua franca, used not only as the first language in the so-called Inner Circle, i.e., the English-speaking countries, but also the second language used in the Outer Circle (i.e., the post-colonial countries), as well as an increasingly popular and important foreign language used for international communication in the Expanding Circle (cf. Kachru 1988, 1992). In the context of India, a country renowned in the world for its cinematography, English has also been associated with show-business. It is not uncommon to hear Hindi-English code-mixing on national Indian TV and radio channels, but also more and more often in Indian, and especially Hindi movies. The reason for this, as Gardner-Chloros (2009: 78) claims, is the “appeal to the widest possible audience, including young second-generation Asians whose main language is English, as well as their parents’ and grandparents’ generation, whose main language may be one of a variety of Indian languages (e.g., Punjabi, Gujarati), but who have Hindi as a language of literacy” (cf. Garden-Chloros and Charles 2007). Thus, as Gardner-Chloros (2009: 79) further states, it is “a compromise to suit an audience with various levels of competence in English and Hindi – many themselves code-switchers – and simultaneously functional within the conversation itself.” This is, therefore, the context within which the examples of code-switching collected on Facebook will be analyzed.

5. COMPUTER-MEDIATED COMMUNICATION (CMC) AS A SOURCE OF SOCIOLINGUISTIC DATA

I have chosen the medium of Facebook, the most popular social network, in order to examine the phenomenon of code-switching of Hindi speakers for a number of reasons. Code-switching is primarily studied in the context of the spoken medium, as it is a natural and even subconscious choice – indeed, as some researchers have managed to establish (cf. Wardhaugh 1991), bilingual speakers in multilingual contexts even claim they do not code-switch, whereas in fact, as recordings demonstrate, they do, which only proves that the lexicons of the codes involved are to a large extent combined at the cognitive level. One study of CS in the spoken medium was an investigation of linguistic behavior in Hindi-English bilingual media in Britain carried out by Gardner-Chloros and Charles (2007); another, in this case concerning Punjabi-English switching (Punjabi is a dialect related to Hindi), was analyzed on the basis of natural conversations (cf. Gardner-Chloros, Charles and Cheshire 2000). Apart from examining social patterns manifesting themselves through CS, linguists have also analyzed some specific grammatical and semantic

aspects of Hindi-English CS (cf. Romaine 1986, Borowiak 2010). Facebook, on the other hand, is a written medium, and the analysis of CS in writing, much less studied, provides an additional dimension to the discussion of the phenomenon. It has to be stressed, however, that the CMC language which characterizes Facebook as well as other CMC options, is not exactly the same variety as that to be found in, e.g., newspapers or academic texts. It demonstrates a high level of informality and allows for much spontaneity in reactions, as a result of which it departs from the classical features of the written language, such as e.g., time-lag, careful wording, greater formality, more complex grammar, decontextualization, etc. (cf. Crystal 2001, Baron 2008, Jenkins 2009). Thus, it shares many features with the spoken medium (for example, more colloquial language, ad hoc formations, often no time-lag, contractions, etc.), which supports the claim of some linguists that we should depart from the traditional dichotomy between speech and writing (cf. Tannen 1982, Murray 1988, Jenkins 2009, Dąbrowska 2001, 2010), especially since the status of CMC language has not yet been fully established – it is treated as a new register (cf. Davis and Brewer 1997), a new genre (Duszak and Okulska 2004) or even a new medium/channel of communication (Crystal 2001, Stockwell 2002). Thus, the examination of CMC will gradually help in the collection of more complete information concerning the new language variety. Facebook as such is also a very precious source of study material as a medium which can be freely accessed by anyone and, apart from private messages and semi-private posts left on the walls of one's contacts, there are also numerous fan pages of a variety of celebrities, phenomena, and objects, which encourage and accept comments from anyone. Facebook is therefore an invaluable mine of easily-accessible colloquial and spontaneous language samples which may serve as an insight into the linguistic and social practices of various groups. The fact, however, that it is up to a point a written medium should be perceived as an asset, too. When putting words on paper, and very much the same on the computer screen, one does make some semi-conscious or conscious decisions as to what will be read by others, and in the case of the Facebook world not only by close friends, but also possibly more distant acquaintances and, in the case of fan pages, strangers. Thus, the fact that one decides to choose one linguistic form and not the other indirectly indicates how one wants to be perceived by others through the prism of one's language choices. It also shows acceptance of the overall tendency prevailing in a given group if one decides to follow the practice commonly utilized by its members.

6. COMMUNITY OF PRACTICE

This brings us back to the concept of the *community of practice* mentioned above (cf. also *virtual community* or *community of discourse* – Seidlhofer

2006). It is a relatively new and not yet widespread concept suggested by Eckert and McConnell-Ginet (1992: 464) for "aggregate(s) of people who come together around mutual engagement in an endeavor." These concepts were postulated as a reaction to some research developments in linguistics connected with the phenomenon of globalization and the notion of English as a lingua franca slowly being recognized by sociolinguists. As Seidlhofer (2006) suggests, due to the omnipresent use of English all over the world, and particularly its recognition as an official language in the post-colonial states, the traditional model for the analysis of English based on the primary notions of speech community is no longer associated with Britain or the USA, but is pluricentric (cf. Kachru 1992, Jenkins 2009), and thus dependent on a given local context. It is therefore hard to study the use of English within the speech community, as the English speech community in the traditional sense of the word no longer exists, since users of English do not live in close proximity any more. An answer to this is the concept of the above-mentioned community of practice, which generates certain standards of language use and norms of its interpretation not for people bound together geographically and culturally, but for those linked by a certain activity in connection with which English is used. Wenger (1998, after Jenkins 2009: 211) mentions that the primary criteria for such communities are "1. mutual engagement in shared practices, 2. taking part in some jointly negotiated enterprise, and 3. making use of members' shared repertoire." Thus, those users might be quite removed from one another in terms of distance, nationality or culture, yet it is the involvement in a certain activity that brings them together and as such creates norms of behavior in a given situational context. In addition, since the notion of appropriateness usually relates to the evaluation of speech behavior of the primary social community, "it is likely to be appropriate in many, if not most contexts in which English is currently used, not to fully conform to native speaker conventions" (Seidlhofer 2006, after Jenkins 2009: 212). This means that in this respect the use of language may be better viewed as an example of register, i.e., an occupational/situational variety (cf. Seidlhofer 2006). This is also my approach to the interpretation of the linguistic behavior of the Facebook users who take part in interaction on fan pages. In view of this, my claim is that the phenomenon of code-switching, to be observed in the collected posts, was motivated by the user's participation in a community of practice. The community in a broad sense would be the community of Facebook users, i.e., persons who subscribe to the semi-formal or even casual style of interaction typical of communication with friends and acquaintances, which is typified by, e.g., the predominant use of the first name in addressing others as well as the use of informal language strategies such as colloquialisms, emoticons, abbreviations, humor, and who share news and observations with a group of friends (a group which may expand gradually with the admission of other people one does

not know very well). Also, to a large extent, as Facebook connects people globally, it appears that many of its users, irrespective of their nationality, decide to interact with others in English, put up their own messages on Facebook walls in English, and comment on the walls of others in English as well (some may do it in their own mother tongue alongside English). Among my own Facebook contacts almost one third are native speakers of English, and out of the remaining two thirds of a very international group only ca. 15% use their native language to write wall posts, the others using only English or English and their native tongue side by side. Thus, English is to a large extent an important, indeed, almost obligatory requirement for one who wants to be a member of this community of practice.

7. THE STUDY DATA

In my analysis I have decided to examine the language behavior of Indian Facebook users, and specifically the language of the posts written by fans on one of the globally-accessible fan pages. I selected the fan page of one of the most renowned Hindi movie stars, Shah Rukh Khan, and specifically his fans' comments after his having posted a trailer concerning the release of one of the greatest Hindi movie classics, *Mughal-e-Azam*, in color. The choice of the fan page was dictated by the fact that it is managed in English, much as most other fan pages are, and since Shah Rukh Khan is also extremely popular outside Indian borders, I assumed it would attract an international fan following, as a result of which the comments would be written predominantly in English. On the other hand, Shah Rukh Khan is primarily a Hindi movie star, an icon in India, especially in its northern part, and in Pakistan, a Muslim actor who has gained huge recognition among both Muslim and Hindu inhabitants of that region, therefore, as I had envisaged, in order to emphasize his heritage, some fans might choose to write their comments in Hindi. It must be hard at times to decide which language to use – whether English, because it is an international language, and a very prestigious tongue in India (cf. Gardner-Chloros and Charles 2007) as well as the language of the majority of Facebook posts, or Hindi as a manifestation of one's ethnic and cultural background as well as pride stemming from the Hindi movie star's global fame. Another reason for the use of Hindi may be a poorer command of English, which, although used as a primary means of education in India, often leaves a lot to be desired, both in speech and writing (cf. Dąbrowska 2011b). I believe this dilemma is often resolved by the user's decision to code-switch in their posts in order to show respect to both tongues, which is a feature characterizing the community of Indian Hindi film fans.

My specific analysis will comprise 55 posts written on the fan page on March 11, 2011, out of 401 posts put up on the wall on that day. Out of these

259 were written only in English, 17 only in Hindi, and 55 showed code-switching (the remaining number covered miscellaneous posts, i.e., those in other languages, like French, German, Indonesian, etc., or the content could have been classified as belonging to any language, e.g., some exclamations like 'wow!' or emoticons). We can therefore already see that the predominant language of the posts was English, despite the majority of respondents being Indian, likely from northern India (as in the south of India Hindi film actors do not enjoy such great popularity as local ones due to the already mentioned north-south language animosities and overall linguistic and cultural differences), and only a few were composed in Hindi. The fact that 13% of the users chose to code-switch is a significant proportion which cannot be overlooked.

The discussion of the examples will first focus on the formal classification of the posts in terms of the code-switching structure, based on Poplack's (1980, 1981) classification into extra-, inter- and intrasentential items, and will be followed by a brief grammatical analysis of the posts. Then the function of the elements expressed by the two respective languages will be discussed in each of the distinguished categories. As concerns the form of the presented examples, they will be written in the Latin alphabet, mirroring exactly the spelling of the original posts. This means that they will retain both the individual approach to Hindi-English transcription (which may also reflect dialectal differences, e.g., Hindi vs. Urdu, Punjabi or Bengali), mistakes in spelling as well as all shortening strategies which are commonly found in CMC English and, up to a point, in Hindi when transcribed in the Latin script as well. However, when commenting on the Hindi elements of the analyzed posts and providing a full form of selected text fragments, I will use a more officially recognized version of the Hindi transcription. It will not be the academic variant of the script, as this would often depart from the version used in the posts quite significantly, thereby causing too much confusion, but the popular transcription commonly found in the media, which is closer to the phonetic spelling in which the posts were written.

Below, a couple of examples are offered which will help in understanding the degree of difficulty concerning the deciphering of the spelling used by the authors. It stems not only from the fact that there is no single established transliteration system of Hindi characters into English, but also from users' ignoring the popular transcription variant used in printed texts, like books and newspapers, a result of CMC language fashion as well as the users' subconscious drive to make the transcription more phonetic than the official, but admittedly unhelpful and misleading system. The difficulty is also at times augmented by the fact that some Hindi sounds, particularly the retroflex consonants, do not have an equivalent in English, and hence a duality of spelling resulting from the approximation to the two nearest sounds, e.g., 'thoda'/'thora' ('a little'). Thus, e.g., according to the Hindi-English translit-

eration system the pronoun 'I' ('main'), is found in some posts, e.g., 'main tumara sabse bada fan hu,' however, a fair number of authors write it as 'mai,' 'mein,' or even 'me,' e.g., 'mein tuhada bahut vda fan hai' or 'me nach-eez apka ek fan hu.' Some other alternative spellings include, e.g., 'mujhe' vs. 'muze'/'muja,' 'hazar' vs. 'hajar,' 'zyada' vs. 'jyada,' etc. The confusion in these examples comes from the fact that in Hindi the sounds /dʒ/ and /z/, the latter a borrowing from Persian, are written by means of the same character, but /z/ has an additional diacritic, a dot at the bottom left of the character. However, many printed texts – even school books – omit the dot, hence the ambiguity of how to depict it in the Latin alphabet, and the resulting substitution of /z/ for /dʒ/ in spelling. Some other discrepancies in spelling are, e.g., 'hun' vs. 'hu,' 'hain' vs. 'hai'/'he'/'h,' 'kyon' vs. 'kyu,' 'uske' vs. 'ushke,' etc. An additional complication stems from the fact that there is no fixed standard in Hindi as to whether some grammatical elements should be spelled together with the neighbouring word or separately, especially when it comes to postpositions, e.g., 'aap ko' vs. 'aapko,' and, that the authors very often omit vowel sounds altogether, thereby reflecting the actual spelling in Hindi, where each consonantal letter is in fact a syllable containing a short /a/ as the second element. Additionally, some users mark the long vowels dutifully by their double spelling, while others do not, e.g., 'aap' vs. 'ap.' And thus 'bat jab bhi main aapke bare mai...' becomes 'bt jab b me aapke bare me,' and 'koi bhi nahi ho sakta...' becomes 'koi v nai ho skta,' 'ke bare me' becomes 'k breme.' Such cases are quite numerous. What no doubt contributes to this tendency is mimicking the strategies of abbreviating words in CMC English, i.e., the above-mentioned letter-word substitution or vowel deletion strategies. All in all, the result becomes quite chaotic, with each user following his or her private system of transliteration, which may give the impression of great differences in the quality of language used, where in fact there are none.

It also should be noted that some of the posts may in fact contain elements of, or even be written in Urdu, which at this point, due to its being the official language of Pakistan and of some Indian states, is treated as a different tongue. However, both Hindi and Urdu are in fact dialects of Hindustani, an Indo-European language used in India particularly before regaining independence (sometimes also referred to as Hindi-Urdu). Hindi and Urdu are thus dialects of Hindustani. In today's India they have gained recognition as two separate languages, which is mostly visible at the level of the script (Hindi is written in the Devanagari script, and Urdu in the Perso-Arabic script) as well as literary, cultural, and religious associations and the respective vocabulary choices. In their standardized forms Hindi and Urdu may therefore be identified as distinct tongues, however, when in the so-called *bol-chal ki bhasha*, i.e., the colloquial language, and especially when written with the Latin alphabet, they are practically indistinguishable (cf. Stasik

2006). In fact, Hindustani may even be sometimes used as a reference to all Hindi/Urdu-related dialects. In my further discussion I will therefore not attempt to distinguish between the dialects which may have appeared in the analyzed posts and use the term Hindi indiscriminately to avoid introducing unnecessary complexity to the analyzed subject.

8. CODE-SWITCHING VS. BORROWING

Before the classification of the switches is presented, some comments need to be offered with regard to the concept of linguistic borrowings. Opinions are divided as to whether borrowings can be classified as examples of code-switching or not, with some linguists claiming they can (e.g., Gardner-Chloros 1987, Myers-Scotton 1992), and others excluding them from this category (viz. Poplack and Sankoff 1984, Poplack 1988, Poplack and Meechan 1995, Gabryś 2000). The evidence in support of the first option is that there is a diachronic continuity between code-switching and borrowing, the former constituting the initial stage for the phenomenon of borrowing (cf. Gardner-Chloros 1987), while the opposite view claims that despite the presence of L2 borrowings in L1 the character of the languages involved remains separate. Also, quite logically, code-switching assumes at least some degree of bilingualism of both parties involved, whereas borrowings, once they are established in a language, are also used by those who are monolingual. I believe the separation of the two phenomena would indeed hold true in such contexts as Poland, where bilingualism is a rare phenomenon, and even fluent speakers of L2, mostly adolescent bilinguals formed through the exposure to L2 in the school context, show a different pattern of use of the two languages than bilingual users in a multilingual context, and code-switch relatively rarely, with the two varieties involved typically being clearly distinguished (cf. Gabryś 2000, Dąbrowska 2010, 2011a). In a multilingual setting this separation and the conscious monitoring of L1 and L2 is much harder, and even if some speakers choose to speak only L1, it will still be heavily affected by the parallel existence of L2, and thus there will be frequent cases of borrowings from L2 found in L1. Other speakers may make use of both L1 and L2 either situationally or metaphorically, or else may decide to mix the varieties in one conversation. As a result, that which has a status of a borrowing for the former group, i.e., a status of an integrated element of L1 at this stage, will be a part of L2 in the latter case. As Aikhenvald (2002: 197) claims, “what appears to be a nonce borrowing, or an occasional code-switch, for one speaker, could be an established morpheme for another speaker.” I would therefore argue that in the multilingual context of India the distinction between borrowings and code-switches is virtually impossible to draw, unless individual items and individual speakers are investigated in this

respect. Thus, in the analysis below I will treat all, even single-word occurrences of L2 (i.e., English), as examples of CS, bearing in mind that some speakers in India may indeed treat them only as borrowings.

9. THE MATRIX LANGUAGE IN THE ANALYZED SWITCHES

This leads us to the establishment of what the Matrix Language and the Embedded Language are in the analyzed context of the Facebook posts. Traditionally, linguists tend to keep these two entities separate, usually assigning the role of ML to L1, and EL to L2 (cf. Myers-Scotton 2009). However, as admitted by Myers-Scotton, L2 may also constitute the ML in a conversation. On the other hand, so-called composite code-switching, a new trend in the field, allows for both L1 and L2 to provide some of the abstract structure of the frame (cf. Muysken 2000, Clyne 2003). Composite CS is not a very advanced area of study, however, which is why I will follow the classical approach in analyzing the collected examples. Even though a number of posts actually begin in English, and the English segment may be quite extended, I assume that, at least in the majority of the examples collected, it is Hindi that provides the structural frame. The main reason for this is that for most Indian speakers English is the second, and sometimes even the third language acquired through education, although indeed there is a certain percentage of families which decide to speak only or predominantly English at home (cf. Jenkins 2009), and thus Hindi and other dialects would be more deeply ingrained at the cognitive level and provide the structure more readily. Some of the collected examples do offer proofs for considering L1 the ML, e.g.,:

- (1) i luv u shahrukh...wish u *ki* everyone in bollywood supports ur creativity work n uuu...
 'I love you Shah Rukh. I wish you that everyone in Bollywood supports your creativity work and you...'

The sentence is almost entirely in English, yet the whole subordinate construction is in fact supported by a one-word switch, the linking word '*ki*' meaning 'that.' It naturally would have been very easy to keep the English word, yet it seems that the Hindi element is akin to a pivot on which the whole sentence structure is supported. Gabrys' (2000) claims that such switches, mainly discourse markers, are performed subconsciously, which would corroborate the claim that the abstract framework of the sentence is in Hindi. Further examples are provided below:

- (2) yaar kya *trailer* he mujhe kuch nahi dikh raha..mai *mobile internet* use kar raha hu 'What trailer man, I do not see anything... I am using mobile Internet'

- (3) srk k *family* k bare mai jiss jiss ne bi ghalat batain keye hai oss sab ko mai *search* kar raha ho
 'I'm searching for all those who have said something wrong about SRK's family'
- (4) [...] 1 *advice* *specly* unlogo k lia jo srk k breme ulte fulte *cmmt* krte hai unlogo ki khud ki to koi aukaad nai h.. [...] Aur haan Salaman ki utni aukaad nai h jo srk se *compare* kro...
 'a piece of advice specially for those who make wrong comments, these people themselves do not know where their place is. [...] And of course Salmaan does not know much where his place is that you compare him to SRK...'
- (5) [...] Magar fark ye hai ki me jitni shiddat se apki *filmo* ka *wait* karta hu waise koi bhi nahi karta hoga
 'But the difference is nobody waits for your [Hon]¹ films with so much endurance as I do'

An interesting indication of the native language structure in these, indeed, predominantly Hindi examples are the following phrases spelled in the standard manner: '*use* kar raha hun' ('I am using'), '*mai search* kar raha hun' ('I am searching for'), '(jo) *comment* karte hai' ('[who] comment'), '(jo) *compare* karo' ('(you who) compare him') and '*se* apki *filmon* ka *wait* karta hun' ('I wait for your films'). The verb phrases here make use of complex verb forms '*use* karna,' '*search* karna,' '*comment* karna,' '*compare* karna,' and '*wait* karna,' which reflect the structure of complex verbs in Hindi consisting of a noun or an adjective + '*karna*' ('do'), here, respectively: '*prayog* karna,' '*ta-laash* karna,' '*tippani* karna,' '*tulna*'/'*mukabla* karna' and '*pratiksha*'/'*intazaar* karna' (cf. Romaine (1986) for Punjabi-English switches). It is quite significant that the second element of these verb forms is kept in Hindi, although in English they are just single morphemes, and most likely phrases like, e.g., '*mai mobile Internet use* raha hun' or '*mai search* raha hun' would have been quite sufficient. However, when such switches, and later borrowings, are made, these verbs tend to be converted into nouns and inserted in the Hindi verb phrases with '*karna*,' '*dena*,' ('give'), '*hona*' ('be'), etc. Thus, the underlying Hindi structure appears to be deeply ingrained in the writers' minds. Moreover, also pointing to the underlying Hindi structure in these examples is the fact that those elements which form verb phrases with the help of English words come at the end of the clauses, following their objects, thereby reflecting the word order in Hindi sentences.

¹ The sign [Hon] to be found in the English translations indicates the use of a honorific, i.e., a title, phrase or grammatical element conveying respect to someone of a higher social standing.

- (6) main tumara sabse bada *fan* hu *please* mujhe apni *friend's* ki *least* me samil karlo main bhi aap ki tharha *hero* banna chahata hu.
'I am your greatest fan. Please include me in your friends' list. I also want to become a hero like you'
- (7) *i thought* ra1 ka *promo*.....kiya yar
'I thought (it was) Ra1 promo... what's that, man'

Examples (6) and (7) are two more examples of predominantly Hindi structures, but of special interest here are the phrases 'apni *friend's* ki *least*' and 'ra1 ka *promo*,' in which we can again see the Hindi grammatical structure, this time concerning the modifiers which describe the words 'least' (i.e., an erroneously spelled word 'list'), and 'promo,' respectively. These two phrases follow the Hindi structure of having postpositions 'ki' (for feminine nouns) and 'ka' (for masculine), which mark possession. They have been kept there despite the fact that the phrases 'friend's list' and 'Ra1 promo' would be perfectly sufficient in English, albeit indeed with a mistake in the position of the apostrophe in example (6), which should follow rather than precede the genitive '-s' (i.e., 'friends' list' rather than 'friend's list'). As a result of retaining the English genitive ending side by side with the postposition we in fact obtain a double genitive.

It is hoped that these three groups of examples sufficiently support the claim that the underlying structure of most posts is determined by the users' L1. Indeed, this seems to be quite visible in the case of code-mixing, which the above examples belong to. Code-mixing, i.e., Poplack's (1988) intrasentential switching, however, is only one of the three possible CS structural categories, viz. extra-, inter- and intrasentential CS. What follows is the classification of the collected posts into respective groups, which will be discussed both in terms of their formal features and the possible functions which the switches may perform.

10. EXTRA-SENTENTIAL SWITCHES

Extra-sentential switches are the switches in which the code-switched elements are not an integral part of the sentence, as the sentence remains meaningful and largely unchanged without them. These would include tag questions, interjections, greetings, pleas, etc.,:

- (8) *hi* srk mai app se milna chahta ho*plz*
'Hi SRK, I want to meet you... please'
- (9) *Hi* khan saab kaha ajkal itne door
'Hi, Mr Khan, where are you so far away these days?'

- (10) *Sir*, kya aap mujhse dosti karenge
 'Sir, will you [Hon] make friends with me?'

It can easily be seen that extra-sentential switching, i.e., the simplest form of CS, one which does not require a high degree of bilinguality or foreign language command, is hardly represented. The post authors all know the two involved languages well enough to be able to perform more complex examples of CS. As noted above, in terms of their form extra-sentential switches simply involve the use of individual words which do not have to be integrated into the L1 structure, and thus present no challenge formally. It appears that these English elements might in fact be subsumed under the category of borrowings. In particular, the greeting 'hi' is a very universal form in many countries which have been heavily influenced by English. What is more important, however, is that it also constitutes an informal greeting alternative which Hindi does not possess, and at the same time a neutral one in comparison to the religious 'namaste'/'namaskar' (used by the Hindus) or 'salaam' (used by the Muslims). It is therefore a useful addition to the distinction in terms of register and style in L1, and especially popular with the young generation.

The situation is similar in the case of the term of address 'sir,' which can often be heard in everyday life when one is addressing a stranger in a semi-formal or formal situation, and which is a term found particularly often in the corporate context. The functional distribution of 'sir' is certainly different from that attached to it in Britain, as its use is much more universal and may apply to any stranger, not only a high-ranked one (the same, in fact, would hold for 'madam'). It is therefore a marker of social distance and respect, and at the same time it carries a sense of neutrality when compared to the word 'sahab,' which has its origin in the Muslim religion, although now it is used more generally. 'Sir' could also in a way be treated as an equivalent of the Hindi honorific 'ji,' a suffix attached to names or titles of persons speakers wish to show respect to (e.g., father, mother or other family or society members deserving of respect). However, it is notable that one occasionally sees or hears an interesting hybrid form 'sirji,' as in, e.g., 'U just rock the bollywood. your new look in don2 is awesome. keep go on *sirji*.' It clearly shows that 'sir' has integrated quite well with the L1 context, becoming a title used on a par with native ones – the fact that 'ji' is spelled jointly with 'sir' certainly emphasizes this. Interestingly, though, apart from the fact that 'ji' gets attached to names and titles, it may also appear on its own, as in 'Haan ji,' which would mean 'yes, sir/madam' – thus, the form 'sirji' can be treated as a particularly strong marker of respect, with 'sir' used as a title and 'ji' as an additional element indicating social distance.

Last but not least, the word 'please' is also one which enriches the Hindi lexicon. Formally, it has a very different character than its possible equiva-

lent in Hindi, as Hindi does not in fact possess a word like ‘please,’ except for the very formal and functionally limited ‘krpaya,’ which would be completely unsuitable for the informal context. If one wants to make a request, the element of pleading typically manifests itself in the verbal ending attached to the main verb. The author of the post could have probably formulated (10) as ‘mujhse dosti kijiye’ or even ‘mujhse dosti kijiyege’ (‘make [Hon] friends with me please’), but they sound extremely polite and formal. In the example analyzed, however, the structure of the sentence is not in fact a request, but a wish ‘main... milna chahta hun’ (‘I want to meet’), and only the addition of ‘please’ at the end changes its illocutionary force, thereby converting it into a request. The frequency of the use of ‘please’ in the collected examples suggests that it is a welcome extension of the Hindi pragmatic devices. It is also a structure easier and shorter to use when compared to the above-mentioned options offered by Hindi, the significance of which is also not to be ignored. Myers-Scotton (1979) claims that code-switching of whatever kind is motivated by the prospect of possible rewards the speaker might gain, and the reward here may be the ease of use and its speed. Additionally, as the posts are written in CMC context, which tends to show preference for abbreviated forms and language minimization (cf. Dąbrowska 2010, Dąbrowska forthcoming), its application is particularly useful here.

III. INTERSENTENTIAL SWITCHES

In intersentential switches, switching takes place at the boundary between two sentences/clauses/utterances. It is typically marked by pauses or dots. In many of the collected examples, however, the dots are missing, yet it appears to be possible to separate the clauses quite easily. Altogether 19 posts exhibiting this strategy were collected. Some examples of this structure are as follows:

- (12) *my father have been died and my mother is hepatitis patient we r only 2 sisters. but we r happy 2 c u especially i like ur this dialoge* zindgi main hamysha apny dil ke suno ager dil jawb na dy tw apny dil pr hath rakh kr apny mama baba ka naam lo pher sub thek ho jay ga inshallha *thanks shah rukh* 4 ur comment *GOD BLESS U EVER AND 4EVER*
 ‘my father has died and my mother is a hepatitis patient, we are only two sisters, but we are happy to see you, especially I like this dialogue of yours: In life always listen to your heart, and if your heart has not replied to you, put your hand on your heart, remember your mother and father and everything will be fine, God willing. Thanks Shahrukh for your comment. God bless you ever and forever’

- (13) *salim tume marne nhi dega...aanar kali.... aur hmm tume jeene nhi denge...wen srk says dis, it sounds more intrestn.....*
 'Salim will not let you die, Anarkali... and he will not let you live... When Shahrukh says this, it sounds more interesting...'
- (14) *U R AMAZING.....RAJ.....NAAM TO SUNA HOGA.....*
 'you are amazing... raj... you must have heard this name'
- (15) *old is gold.....ek itihask virasat....MUGAL-E-AJAM.....*
 'old is gold... it is a historical heritage... Mughal-e-Azam'
- (16) *And a very good morning to you king khan :-)* Allah kare ke ek din aapse mulakat ho 'And a very good morning to you, King Khan :-). May Allah grant it that I may meet you one day'
- (17) *Hi dude-rocking* Aap salman se dosti karlo.
 'Hi dude-rocking. Make friends with Salman'
- (18) *Hi KING! I'm frm kolkata. U r my fav. What is nxt?* Ra1 ya Dhoom3? Be-tab hun yaar tumhare *film* k liye!
 'Hi King. I'm from Calcutta. You are my favourite. What is next? Ra1 or Dhoom 3? I am impatient for your film, man!'
- (19) *hi srk u r good actor not perfect like aamir.....*wo agar kahi pe thokna bhi chahe to soch samjh ke karta hai....
 'Hi SRK, you are a good actor, not perfect [=perfectionist] like Aamir... Even if he wants to spit somewhere, he will think about it'
- (20) *GOOLUCK SRK...hamari nek tamanne aap k sath hai*
 'Good luck SRK... All our warmhearted energy is with you'
- (21) *Happy BirthDay.....* tum jio hajaro sal.....
 'Happy birthday... live thousands of years!'

The selected examples from the intersentential category are, similarly to the extra-sentential switches, grammatically quite easy cases: they come after a dot or a pause and therefore, there is no danger of violating any internal grammatical constraints. Both the segments expressed in Hindi and in English, respectively, are self-contained and largely well-formed wholes. Only examples (12) and (17) show some deviation from the grammatical as well as the spelling rules, for example, 'my father has been died' involves the wrong use of 'been,' probably modeled on the Hindi 'mere pita ji mar gaye hain', 'my mother is hepatitis patient' illustrates omission of the indefinite article, which is very frequent in Indian English (Stockwell 2002, Jenkins 2009), and, a more typical construction would be 'my mother has/suffers from hepatitis', 'I like ur this dialoge,' in which probably an unedited use of the possessive is then substituted by the demonstrative pronoun, 'hi dude-rocking' which is presumably a compound construction with a present participle frequently found in classical Hindi poetry meaning 'hi dude, you are rocking'. Beside these examples, we do see some departures from the norms concerning the spelling of words. Apart from possible misprints such as, e.g., 'dialoge,' the changes to a large extent coincide with the abbreviated forms of English

typically used in CMC, e.g., the number-word and letter-word substitutions, as in ‘4u,’ ‘we r only 2 sisters. but we r happy 2 c u,’ ‘U R amazing,’ ‘U r my fav,’ vowel deletion, i.e., ‘I’m frm kolkata,’ ‘What is nxt?’, clippings, e.g., ‘fav,’ the simplification of ‘wh-,’ as in ‘wen,’ as well as some more typically Indian English strategies, e.g., the spelling of ‘dis,’ which reflects the Indian English substitution of the dental /d/ for the fricative /ð/ (cf. Crystal 2001, Baron 2008). An interesting item is also the form ‘gooluck’ which, as I have been informed, is indeed a simplified pronunciation of the [dl] consonant cluster in the phrase ‘good luck.’ In support of the tendency to simplify consonant clusters one might quote examples of some recognized English-based Hindi phrases as, e.g., ‘fix ret’ (from ‘fixed rate’) and ‘miskol marna’ (from ‘missed call [marna]’). Thus, the English elements largely conform to the patterns followed by native English CMC users. The Hindi elements are well-formed, the only aspect causing difficulty being the already discussed uncontrolled variety of Hindi transcription practices.

As concerns the functions of the analyzed intersentential switches, it appears possible, at least to some extent, to suggest a few, although it also has to be acknowledged that some linguists (cf. Stroud 1992, 1998) claim that no particular intentions exist in the speaker’s mind ahead of time, and the decisions to code-switch are made in the course of the conversation. In view of this, I would like to stress the concept of the community of practice mentioned above. It is certainly the community of Facebook users, and within it – of Indian Facebook users – which is the main determinant of the linguistic practices of users here. They are no doubt linked with two sociolinguistic concepts, namely that of the *audience design* (cf. Bell 1984) and the strategy of *accommodation* (cf. Giles and Powesland 1975). The strategies used are thus in keeping with the structure and expectations of the audience, i.e., the addressees of the conversational turns or posts. Thus, the (Indian) Facebook users, especially those interested in Indian movies, i.e., mainly young adults and middle-aged persons, most likely educated in the English medium, and yet feeling emotionally attached to their native tongue as a marker of their immediate home community, will be expected and will also subconsciously feel obliged to use both codes: L1 as a marker of their ethnic background and L2 as a marker of their social standing. They will therefore accommodate their language to this practice on the basis of abstract connotations that the two tongues evoke in them and in their audience, as well as to the actual practice of the other users, i.e., the preceding comments and the language in which the main topic was worded in general. In this community of practice both Hindi and English are expected and accepted, and this is what most users adhere to here. When defining this particular type of use we can therefore apply Myers-Scotton’s (1993a) unmarked use of code-switching, and in particular the option of a series of switches as an unmarked choice, which is an element of her Markedness Model.

As stated above, however, in some cases it is possible to be somewhat more specific and point to more concrete reasons behind the switches. Thus, examples (12), (13) and (14) seem to have an obvious motivation for keeping some of the messages in Hindi, even though two of them are initiated in English. The segments kept in Hindi are all quotes from well-known Hindi movies, *Kabhi Khushi Kabhi Gham* in (12), *Mughal-e-Azam* in (13), and *Dil-wale Dulhania Le Jayenge* in (14), respectively. Myers-Scotton (1993a) does mention quoting as one of the main reasons for switches, and these three illustrate this rather well. The remaining parts of the posts, which contain more personal opinions and are directed mainly to the fan page idol or make a comment about him, are in English. It may be purely a matter of coincidence that all but one example in this group begin in English, and most of them have the form of a direct address to the idol. However, Shah Rukh Khan as a celebrity is associated with commercial success and a very high social position. As my brief study of the attitude of Indian students towards English has demonstrated (Dąbrowska 2011b), English is viewed as a synonym for high social status and a language of power. It therefore appears appropriate to address a favorite celebrity in this language. When analyzing the English elements in greater detail, it may be noted that the English segments express general sentiments such as good wishes: for a good day, for a happy birthday, for good luck, in praise of the actor, or simply greeting him. The second part of the wish, its more specific extension, however, tends to be in Hindi, especially when, e.g., the user quotes the name of Allah in it or refers to another specific Hindi actor. It may thus be that the more general discourse markers are expressed with the help of fashionable English phrases, whereas the more personal content is naturally associated with Hindi as the language of the home.

12. INTRASSENTENTIAL SWITCHES

Intrasentential switches in Poplack's (1988) classification are the last and the biggest category of switches, comprising 33 items found in the corpus. These examples also illustrate the concept of code-mixing best, as here the elements of L2 appear within the sentences, and often precede or follow them too, so naturally this category will also contain some examples of intersentential switches. The examples to be discussed in greater detail are provided below:

- (22) *hi srk i am big fan of you. Mujhe bhe hero bana he tumhare jesa i have 1 chance please mujhe lagata he ke muja me hero vale bat he*
 'Hi SRK I am a big fan of you. I want to become such a hero as you are. I have one chance please it seems to me that there is something of a hero in me'

- (23) *Hey... I m big fan off srk... God tusi great ho yaar... Hey guys agar tum bhi ho srk ke fan... Den write smthng here nd let us knw... Nd let srk knw it*
 'Hey, I'm a big fan of SRK. God, you are great, man... Hey guys, if you are also SRK's fans... Then write something here and let us know... And let SRK know it'
- (24) *Hey.. Shahrukh i m big fan u. Bt jab b me aapke bare me kuch bura sunata hu to muje bahut bura lagta h. Plz salman se dosti kar lo. Aur aamir ki 3 idiot se b achchi movie bollywood ko dijiye. Plz.. Dont neglect it.*
 'Hey Shahrukh, I'm a big fan of you. Whenever I hear something bad about you [Hon], I very much dislike it. Please [Hon] make friends with Salman. And [Hon] make a better Bollywood film than Aamir's '3 Idiots'. Please. Don't neglect it.'
- (25) *hiiiiiii,, srk. i m the biggest fan of u. love u a lot. nd i pray to god is your all wishes r complete nd all time ap hamesha is duniya pr raaj karo matlab is duniya m sabke f.star aap he ho. loves u a lot*
 'Hiiii, SRK, I'm the biggest fan of you. Love you a lot. And I pray to God that all your wishes are fulfilled, and all the time, you [Hon] always rule in this world, this means, you are the best film star of all in the world'
- (26) *Srk keep on going lyk dis, toh sab k gal pe ek thappad hoga... Bst of luck go 4 it*
 'SRK, keep on going like this, it was like a slap on everyone's face... Best of luck, go for it'
- (27) *Dear sir, me nacheez apka ek fan hu auron ki tarah me bhi apki movie aane ka intzar karta hu. Magar fark ye hai ki me jitni shiddat se apki filmo ka wait karta hu waise koi bhi nahi karta hoga. So plz sir aap mujhe meri id par rply zarur kar dijiye.*
 'Dear sir, I am an inconspicuous fan of yours [Hon] among others waiting for your [Hon] movie to come out. But the difference is that nobody waits for your [Hon] films with so much endurance as I do. So please sir make sure to reply to my email ID'
- (28) *Yaar srk mein magic hai jo use king khan banata hai warna actors to aur bhi hai lekin acting mein sab shahrukh ke bache hai.. Srk u rocks*
 'Man, there is magic in SRK which makes him King Khan. Although there are other actors, when it comes to acting they are all Shahrukh's children. SRK, you rock'
- (29) *vaise aap to hamesha hi smart dikhte ho*
 (((all tyhe best and all is well)))
 'You [Hon] always look smart (all the best and all is well)'
- (30) *main tumara sabse bada fan hu please mujhe apni friend's ki least me samil karlo main bhi aap ki tharha hero banna chahata hu.*
 'I am your biggest fan. Please include me in the list of your [Hon] fans. I also want to become your [Hon] hero'

- (31) kiya mey apse bat karsaqta hu? agar yes to *pls* thora waqt keliye is *number* pe *call* kijiye*ga.pls.pls..pls....*
 'could I talk to you [Hon]? If yes, please kindly call this number for a moment. Please. Please. Please'
- (32) SRK s *bettr* koi ho v skta h kya? Koi v nai ho skta.... Oscar v ushke iye chota sa *award* h.. *He is d b\$T*
 'Can anyone else be better than SRK? No-one can... Oscar is a small award for him. He is the best'
- (33) *off all stars bt srk rock* baki sub saley dheeley hai
 'of all the stars only SRK rocks, all the other bastards are losers'
- (34) Bhaiyo/behno agr kisi ko SRK s *pblm* h to uske *fans page* p *cmmnt* mt kro.. Apkilogo ki etni aukad v nai h
 'Brothers/sisters, if SRK is a problem to anyone, do not make comments on his fan page... You people also do not know your place'
- (35) Jo log khud to kch kr nai skte wai srk ko *loser* khete h... 1 *advice specelly* unlogo k lia jo srk k breme ulte fulte *cmmnt* krte hai unlogo ki khud ki to koi aukaad nai h.. Are phle apne ap ko dkho phr SRK k breme khena... Aur haan Salaman ki utni aukaad nai h jo srk se *cmpare* kro... SRK bs naam hi kafi h..*he is d best*
 'Those who themselves are not able to do anything call SRK a loser... a piece of advice specially for those who make wrong comments, these people themselves do not know where their place is. Hey, look first at yourselves and then talk about SRK... And of course Salmaan does not know much where his place is that you compare him to SRK... SRK's name alone is enough.. He is the best'

A general overview of the above posts shows that they in fact contain a fair number of complete clauses – the most striking ones being the five at the top of the list ((22)-(27)), all of which begin with a sentence or rather a kind of invocation to the idol by directly addressing him, with item (25) containing the longest series of English clauses. They mostly declare that the post authors are big fans of the actor. Complete sentences can also be found in the middle or at the end of some posts, e.g., (22), (23), (24), (26), (28), (29), (32), but they are, as a rule, short and simple structures containing predicative clauses, e.g., 'he is the best'. It is therefore quite a striking feature that the authors do not, as a rule, attempt to use more complex structures in terms of form and meaning. Such short items are usually written in correct English, yet it is clear that some clauses contain mistakes, usually in spelling, e.g., 'neglet,' 'off' for 'of,' 'least' for 'list,' the wrong use of the verbal '-s' ending, as in 'loves you a lot' for the first person, 'Srk you rocks' for the second person, or the omission of the indefinite article 'a,' as in 'I'm big fan of you,' a feature often mentioned as characteristic of Indian English. Apart from the unintentional spelling errors one again must take notice of the use

of markers typical of the CMC type of language, which involves abbreviations of various kinds and departures from the standard spelling, e.g., 'lyk,' 'u,' 'i m,' 'don't,' 'smthng,' 'de bst,' 'den' (the last two examples reflecting the Indian English pronunciation of the fricative /ð/), etc.

As concerns the actual intrasentential switches, it can be seen that as a rule they are single-item switches, these being typically represented by simple nouns, e.g., 'fan,' 'film,' 'movie,' 'magic,' 'actor,' 'hero,' 'problem,' 'sir,' 'star,' 'award,' 'loser,' 'advice,' 'king,' the complex 'fans page,' and more rarely by interjections, like 'please,' or adjectives and adverbs, e.g., 'better,' 'smart,' 'specially.' Characteristically, these words mostly relate to the film context, which in itself is probably more associated with the West, and hence with English. It is also very probable that most of these are simply examples of borrowings, as discussed above, which have been adopted by most people in India, especially in the northern part (cf. the Hindi concept of 'apnana'), with the above-mentioned words enriching the vocabulary and sometimes also introducing new grammatical distinctions, such as the afore-mentioned 'please.' Evidence in support of this assumption might be a form like 'filmo,' correctly transliterated as 'filmon,' the plural form in the oblique case, or the already-discussed 'friend's ki least' (correctly the 'friends' list'). Thus, as regards the grammatical constraints of the Matrix Language, these single-word items do not present any danger, as they are easily incorporated into the sentence, i.e., substituted for the native items, or else added as extra-sentential elements. Verbs appear more risky with regard to Hindi sentence structure, as they take different forms depending on the tense and mood used. On close examination it may be noticed, however, that English forms are skilfully incorporated into complex Hindi structures, as e.g., the already-mentioned 'comment karna' (viz. 'comment karte hai'), 'compare karna' ('compare karo'), 'wait karna' ('wait karta hun') or 'reply kar dena' ('reply kar dijiye') – all of which possess their native Hindi equivalents of complex verbs in which the initial elements, i.e., 'tippani,' 'tulna'/'mukabla,' 'pratiksha/intazaar karna' and 'uttar dena,' respectively, have been substituted by English elements. However, unlike in the Hindi constructions, where the first elements are nouns, they have been substituted by the English verbs, creating a double verbal construction with an English verb followed by the Hindi 'karna' ('do'), 'dena' ('give') or occasionally 'hona' ('be'). On the whole, then, it may be concluded that formally the group of intersentential code-switches is not one which presents a great grammatical risk to its users, and the switches, except for one or two phrases, are not challenging constructions. The above-mentioned verbal phrases also point to the fact that the users do not quite understand the actual grammatical distribution of 'wait,' 'comment,' 'compare' or 'reply,' since they use them as nouns and not verbs (admittedly, 'comment' and 'reply' can be converted into nouns in Standard English). Altogether, it may be concluded that the users do not seem to take

much risk when switching back and forth between the two tongues, at least not in the written form.

The question of the function of the switches has already been partly touched upon here in terms of the use of single word switches – as noted above, they are predominantly borrowings, and as such probably do not even cause the users to realize that they have used a foreign word in these positions. Those words which themselves do possess Hindi equivalents have made their way into Hindi due to their associations with a better, more Western-like and glamorous acting profession and highly popular film industry, as well as with a higher status of living, and therefore bring different, more prestigious connotations. These, as well as the longer complete clause items, although themselves not intrasentential switches, most likely allow their users to indicate that they themselves are better educated, as they know English, and therefore have attained, or have a chance to attain, a better social position. As English has a higher power in India when compared to the local tongues, the switched items also assume a more powerful character and, although expected in the Indian context on a fan page with an international fan following, they probably still add more emphasis to the words expressed in English. As mentioned in the reference to the intersentential switches, the fact that the invocation/term of address at the beginning of the post and directed personally to the admired actor is expressed in English, makes it possible to emphasize the user's positive feelings about the addressee and at the same time it helps to show him greater respect. It is therefore a useful pragmatic tool utilized by Indian users of English.

13. CONCLUDING REMARKS

In conclusion, the community of practice of Indian English Facebook users, notably fans of Hindi films and Hindi movie stars, can be characterized by frequent use of the strategy of Hindi-English code-switching, along with the predominant use of English alone, and in far fewer cases, exclusive use of Hindi. In the case of the switches the Matrix Language is primarily Hindi. The selection of the language of the posts is in keeping with the expectations associated with international fan pages, which can be visited by people from all over the world. However, the fact that both the actor and most of the page visitors are Indian, and happen to share both English as L2 and Hindi as a frequent L1 (as well as Hindi being the official language of the state) causes them to mark their group membership by resorting to both languages. The use of both tongues is therefore expected, and thus largely unmarked. However, a closer examination of the switches has demonstrated that a fair proportion of the switches into English have the form of an invocation to the film star and contain numerous praises, wishes, words of encour-

agement. It may therefore be assumed that one of the functions of English in India is for use when addressing people one does not know in person, and especially people of higher social status, of significant success, and, as in this case, those associated with the world of film and the media. It could thus be suggested that the English switches are used as *discourse markers*, and especially *interactivity markers* expressing reactions to what other people do or say. A switch into English may in such case serve the purpose of reinforcing this meaning.

Formally, the majority of switches investigated here belonged to the category of intrasentential switches, although the posts which featured this category often contained intersentential switches as well. As a result it is difficult to indicate a clear preference between the inter- and intrasentential switches here. It appears more adequate to simply use Blom and Gumperz's (1972) category of code-mixing to describe the character of the switches, be it within or between sentences. Many post authors indeed resort to this option, which is markedly more significant in the written medium (when one makes a more conscious decision as to what to write) than it is with spoken interaction. Yet it also needs to be emphasized that the segments expressed in English are formally quite simple, often following the 'you + attribute', 'I + verb' patterns, or else imperative verb forms. The choice of vocabulary is rather basic, and the intrasentential switches are even less risky for the users than the intersentential ones, as they often utilize words which have already been incorporated into the Hindi, and in many cases, also the international lexicon. The more complex, and sometimes more literary elements (e.g., the film quotes) as well as references to some more personal issues concerning the actor seem to be more preferably expressed in Hindi. Thus English in the switches performed by the members of this community is more of a "guest" language, used out of fashion and the need to stress one's social position, rather than out of a necessity to compensate for gaps in the Hindi lexicon.

REFERENCES

- Aikhenvald, A.Y. (2002). *Language contact in Amazonia*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Auer, P. (1984). *Bilingual conversation*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Auer, P. (ed.) (1998). *Code-switching in conversation: language, interaction and identity*. London: Routledge.
- Auer, P. (1998a). 'Bilingual Conversation' revisited. In P. Auer (ed.). 1-25.
- Baron, N. (2008). *Always on. Language in an online and mobile world*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Baugh, A.C., Cable, T. (2002). *A history of the English language*. Upper Saddle River, NJ,: Pearson Education.

- Bell, A. (1984). Language style as audience design. *Language in Society* 13: 145-204.
- Blom, J.P., Gumperz, J.J. (1972). Social meaning in linguistic structures: code-switching in Norway. In J.J. Gumperz and D. Hymes (eds.). *Directions in sociolinguistics: the ethnography of communication*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston. 407-34.
- Borowiak, T. (2010). Wpływy angielskie w kolokwialnej odmianie hindi – studium kontaktolingwistyczne. *Investigationes Linguisticae* 20: 1-9.
- Clyne, M. (2003). *Dynamics of language contact*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Crystal, D. (2001). *Language and the internet*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Crystal, D. (2005). *The stories of English*. London: Penguin Books.
- Das Gupta, J. (1970). *Language conflict and national development*. Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Davis, B.H., Brewer, J.P. (1997). *Electronic discourse: linguistic individuals in virtual space*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Dąbrowska, M. (2000). Język e-maila jako hybryda mowy i pisma. In G. Szpila (ed.). *Język trzeciego tysiąclecia*. Kraków: Tertium. 95-111.
- Dąbrowska, M. (2010). Functions of code-switching in electronic communication. In M. Jodłowiec and J. Leśniewska (eds.). *Ambiguity and the search for meaning: English and American studies at the beginning of the 21st Century*. Vol 2: *Language and culture*. Cracow: Jagiellonian University Press. 91-106.
- Dąbrowska, M. (2011a). Formal characteristics of code-switching in electronic communication (the case of Polish and English). In S. Varella (ed.). *Languages and cultures in contact and contrast: historical and contemporary perspectives*. Athens: Atiner. 171-188.
- Dąbrowska, M. (2011b). Indian youth and the English language. In P. Chruszczewski and Z. Wąsik (eds.). *Languages in Contact 2010*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Wyższej Szkoły Filologicznej we Wrocławiu. 47-60.
- Dąbrowska, M. (forthcoming). Language economy in short text messages. *Studia Linguistica Universitatis Iagellonicae Cracoviensis*.
- Duszak, A., Okulska, U. (2004). Introduction. Globalisation and linguistics: some issues and problems. In A. Duszak and U. Okulska (eds.). *Speaking from the margin. Global English from a European perspective*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang. 7-13.
- Dwivedi, S. (1981). *Hindi on trial*. Delhi: Vikas Publishing House.
- Eckert, P. (2000). *Linguistic variation as social practice*. Oxford/Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Eckert, P., McConnell-Ginet, S. (1992). Think practically and look logically: language and gender as community-based practice. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 21(4): 21-6.
- Gabryś, D. (2000). Code-switching as a communication strategy. In B. Rozwadowska (ed.). *PASE Papers in Language Studies*. Wrocław: Aksel S.C. 115-125.

- Gafaranga, J. (2005). Demythologising language alternation studies: conversational structure vs. social structure in bilingual interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics* 37: 281-300.
- Gardner-Chloros, P. (1987). Code-switching in relation to language contact and convergence. In G. Lüdi (ed.). *Devenir bilingu-parler bilingu; actes du 2ème colloque sur bilinguisme, 20-22 septembre 1984*. Tübingen: Niemeyer. 99-115.
- Gardner-Chloros, P. (1991). *Language selection and switching in Strasbourg*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gardner-Chloros, P. (1995). Code-switching in community, regional and national repertoires: the myth of the discreteness of linguistic systems. In L. Milroy and P. Muysken (eds.). 68-89.
- Gardner-Chloros, P. (2009). *Code-switching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gardner-Chloros, P, Charles, R. (2007). Subiko welcome (*Welcome to everyone*): Hindi/English code-switching in the British-Asian media. *BISAL (Birkbeck Studies in Applied Linguistics)* 2: 89-122.
- Gardner-Chloros, P., Charles, R., Cheshire, J. (2000). Parallel patterns? A comparison of monolingual speech and bilingual codeswitching discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics. Special Issue on Code-switching* 32: 1305-1341.
- Giles, H., Powesland, P. (1975). A social psychological model of speech diversity. In H. Giles, P. Powesland (eds.). *Speech style and social evaluation*. New York: Harcourt Brace. 154-170.
- Hamers, J.F, Blanc, M.H.A. (1989). *Bilinguality and bilingualism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jake, J., Myers-Scotton, C., Gross, S. (2002). Making a minimalist approach to codeswitching work: adding the Matrix Language. *Bilingualism, Language and Cognition* 5: 69-91.
- Jake, J., Myers-Scotton, C., Gross, S. (2005). A response to MacSwan (2005): *Keeping the Matrix Language*. *Bilingualism, Language and Cognition* 8: 1-6.
- Jenkins, J. (2009). *World Englishes*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Kachru, B. (1988). *The alchemy of English: the spread, functions and models of non-native Englishes*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Kachru, B. (1992). The second diaspora of English. In T.W. Machan, C.T. Scott (eds.). *English in its social contexts. Essays in historical linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 230-252.
- Li Wei. (1998). The 'why' and the 'how' questions in the analysis of conversational code-switching. In P. Auer (ed.). 156-180.
- Macnamara, J. (1967). The bilingual's linguistic performance. *Journal of Social Issues* 23: 58-77.
- MacSwan, J. (2005). Codeswitching and generative grammar: a critique of the MLF model and some remarks on 'modified minimalism.' *Bilingualism, Language and Cognition* 8: 1-22.
- McClure, E, McClure, M. (1988). Macro- and microsociolinguistic dimensions of code-switching in Vingard (Romania). In M. Heller (ed.). *Codeswitching*:

- anthropological and sociolinguistic perspectives*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 25-51.
- Mesthrie, R. (2000). Language Contact 2: Pidgins, Creoles and 'New Englishes'. In R. Mesthrie, J. Swann, A. Deumert and W.L. Leap (eds.). *Introducing sociolinguistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. 279-315.
- Milroy, L., Muysken, P. (eds.). 1995. *One speaker, two languages. Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Murray, D.E. (1988). The context of oral and written language: a framework for mode and medium switching. *Language and Society* 17(3): 351-373.
- Muysken, P. (2000). *Bilingual speech: a typology of code mixing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1979). Codeswitching as a "safe choice" in choosing a lingua franca. In W. McCormack and S. Wurm (eds.). *Language and society. Anthropological issues*. The Hague: Mouton Publishers. 71-87.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1983). The negotiation of identities in conversation: a theory of markedness and code choice. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 44: 115-136.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1992). Comparing code-switching and borrowing. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 13(1/2): 19-39.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1993a). *Social motivations for codeswitching: evidence from Africa*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1993b). *Duelling languages: grammatical structure in codeswitching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1995). A lexically based model of code-switching. In L. Milroy and P. Muysken (eds.). 233-256.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (2002a). *Contact linguistics: bilingual encounters and grammatical outcomes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (2009). Code-switching. In N. Coupland and A. Jaworski (eds.). *The new sociolinguistics reader*. Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. 473-489.
- Poplack, S. (1980). Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish Y TERMINO EN ESPANOL: toward a typology of code-switching. *Linguistics* 18: 581-618.
- Poplack, S. (1981). Syntactic structure and social function of code-switching. In R. Duran (ed.). *Latino discourse and communicative behaviour*. Norwood, N.J.: Ablem. 169-184.
- Poplack, S. (1988). Contrasting patterns of code-switching in two communities. In M. Heller (ed.). *Codeswitching: anthropological perspectives*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 215-245.
- Poplack, S., Meechan, M. (1995). Patterns of language mixture: nominal structure in Wolof-French and Fongbe-French bilingual discourse. In L. Milroy and P. Muysken (eds.). 199-232.
- Poplack, S., Sankoff, D. (1984). Borrowing: the synchrony of integration. *Linguistics* 22: 99-135.

- Romaine, S. (1986). The syntax and semantics of the code-mixed compound verb in Panjabi-English bilingual discourse. In D. Tannen & J. Alatis (eds.), *Language and linguistics. The interdependence of theory, data and application*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press. 35-49.
- Sebba, M, Wootton, T. (1998). We, they and identity: sequential vs. identity-related explanation in CS. In P. Auer (ed.), 262-290
- Seidlhofer, B. (2006). English as a lingua franca and communities of practice. In S. Volk-Birke, J. Lippert (eds.). (2007). *Anglistentag 2006 Halle Proceedings*, Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag. 307-318.
- Stasik, D. (2006). *Język hindi*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Akademickie Dialog.
- Stockwell, P. (2002). *Sociolinguistics*. London: Routledge.
- Stroud, C. (1992). The problem of definition and meaning in code-switching. *Text* 12(1): 127-155.
- Stroud, C. (1998). Perspectives on cultural variability of discourse and some implications for code-switching. In P. Auer (ed.), 321-348.
- Tannen, D. (1982). The oral/literate continuum in discourse. In D. Tannen (ed.), *Spoken and written language: exploring orality and literacy*. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex. 1-16.
- Trudgill, P. (1995). *Sociolinguistics. An introduction to language and society*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- Trudgill, P. (2003). *A glossary of sociolinguistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Wardhaugh, R. (1991). *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Iwona Krok

Jagiellonian University in Krakow

SELECTED ENGLISH BORROWINGS IN POPULAR CONTEMPORARY RUSSIAN PRESS ON THE EXAMPLE OF *OGONYOK*

STRESZCZENIE

Pieriestrojka i związane z nią przemiany polityczno-ustrojowe, które miały miejsce w Rosji pod koniec XX wieku, pociągnęły za sobą szereg zmian w życiu wszystkich warstw społeczeństwa. Zaistniałe zmiany spowodowały intensywny napływ zapożyczeń z języka angielskiego. Celem pracy jest przedstawienie najnowszej warstwy pożyczek angielskich w języku rosyjskiej prasy popularnej. Wybór tekstów publicystycznych z czasopisma *Ogoniok* z roku 2008 jako materiału badawczego jest nieprzypadkowy, ponieważ właśnie w prasie najszybciej odzwierciedlane są zmiany w języku mówionym, w którym najwcześniej dokonują się innowacje językowe. Wybrane zapożyczenia z języka angielskiego analizowane są pod kątem procesów adaptacyjnych towarzyszących procesowi zapożyczania materiału leksykalnego. Analizą objęte zostały takie aspekty, jak pisownia wybranych jednostek leksykalnych, ich możliwości słowotwórcze, charakterystyka morfologiczna, własności semantyczne oraz relacje między wyrazami oryginalnymi i ich odpowiednikami w języku biorcy. Szczególną uwagę poświęcono pożyczkom angielskim nie notowanym dotąd w słownikach języka rosyjskiego.

1. THE INFLUENCE OF THE POLITICAL CHANGES AT THE END OF THE 20th CENTURY ON RUSSIAN

The political changes that took place in Russia at the end of the 20th century triggered numerous changes in the life of all social classes. Due to pier-

stroyka, the “iron curtain” fell, paving the way for the development of intensive relations between Russia and Western Europe. The changes occurred in all areas of life, especially in the economy, trade, banking, science and new technologies, that is the areas that had been quickly developing in the West, and from which Russia had been cut off for many decades due to its political system and state isolation (cf. Krysin 1997). “Opening up” to a widely understood civilization progress has led to a whole range of changes in the lexical system of Russian, in which the social changes have been vividly reflected. Since the 1990s till today, numerous new English borrowings have been imported to the Russian language and the trend has not weakened. As observed in many linguistic communities (Mańczak-Wohlfeld 2006), there are many lexical items of English origin which are used in everyday general Russian language which have not found their way into the latest dictionaries of Russian yet. The aim of this paper is to present selected English borrowings that have been transferred into the system of the Russian language relatively recently and to reflect on the role that borrowing plays in providing language users with sufficient resources to meet their communicative needs.

2. THE LANGUAGE OF JOURNALISM AS A REFLECTION OF LANGUAGE INNOVATION

To investigate English borrowings recently added to the lexical resources of the Russian language, I have chosen to gather the empirical material from the language of the press. It seems obvious that the language that speakers use every day must be subject to change in order to fulfill its basic function of living up to the communication needs of the speakers. The linguistic innovations that the speakers introduce to be able to express their thoughts verbally are most quickly reflected in the language of the press, especially popular press addressed to the general public. As is well known, it takes some time before it can be observed whether the innovations become integrated into the linguistic system of the borrowing language or, being ephemeral, disappear after a relatively short period in which they are used by speakers (cf. Gdowska 2005, Mańczak-Wohlfeld 2006).

The linguistic material analyzed here comes from relatively recent editions of a popular Russian magazine *Ogonyok*, issues 40–52 published in 2008. This illustrated magazine has a history of describing Russian and later Soviet reality that goes back to the end of the 19th century – the first issue of *Ogonyok* appeared in 1899. The magazine has been a source of information and inspiration for several generations of Russians now. It has a long tradition and is well known for its high standards of style and text selection. Apart from news coverage, it has always featured articles on literature and culture, and has always addressed intellectuals who are open to discussions and de-

bates. Taking into account the tradition and high publication standards of this magazine, it can be fairly safely taken to be a reliable source of information regarding the current state of standard Russian.

The analysis of the collected material comprises a surprisingly high number of over 700 English lexical items, which are at different levels of familiarization in Russian. There are more than 250 items in the analyzed corpus that are not listed in the latest dictionaries of the Russian language or in current dictionaries of foreign words in Russian, which points to the fact that new English borrowings continuously enter the everyday language of the Russians (cf. Kuznetsov 2004, Sklyarevskaya 2006, Krysin 2007).

3. SEMANTIC FIELDS OF ENGLISH BORROWINGS INTO RUSSIAN IN THE WAKE OF PERESTROYKA

It is worth noticing that initially, i.e., in the 1990s and earlier, the influence of English was mainly limited to providing vocabulary items describing phenomena connected with the development of technology, computerization and international trade. The majority of the English borrowings occurring in the analyzed material and referring to the above-mentioned domains comes from this period of time and is listed in Sklyarevskaya (2006). The borrowings from that early period are on the whole well-adapted to the Russian language, both at the level of spelling, phonology, inflectional morphology, and word formation. Examples of deeply-rooted borrowings that go back to the beginnings of perestroika are the lexical items 'biznes' ('business'), 'biznesmen' ('businessman'), and 'biznesvumen' ('businesswoman'). The high degree of adaptation of the word 'biznes' is indicated by its unified spelling and word-formation potential, which is certainly influenced by the fact that nowadays it also refers to Russian reality and not as before, only to the Western world. In the analyzed material, the word 'biznes' forms a word-formation nest comprising 22 items. All of them have been formed by compounding, which is surprising for an inflectional language like Russian, where compounding is not as common as affixation in deriving new lexical items. The examples include: 'biznes-guru' ('business guru'), 'biznes-lanch' ('business lunch'), 'biznes-ledi' ('business lady'), 'biznes-partnyor' ('business partner'), 'biznes-struktura' ('business structure'), 'biznes-rezultat' ('business profits'), 'biznes-trening' ('business training'), 'biznes-shkola' ('business school'), 'biznes-elita' ('business elite'). For the sake of comparison, it should be added that *Tolkovyi slovar russkogo yazyka nachala XXI veka* (The Dictionary of the Russian Language of the Beginning of the 21st Century) edited by G.N. Sklyarevskaya, one of the most up-to-date dictionaries of contemporary Russian, lists only 15 derivatives based on 'biznes'. The lexical items present in the data analyzed here from Ogonyok and absent in Sklyarevs-

kaya (2006) are: 'avtobiznes' ('car business'), 'biznes-guru' ('business guru'), 'biznes-assotsyatsiya' ('business association'), 'biznes-konsultant' ('business consultant'), 'biznes-obrazovaniye' ('business education'), 'biznes-polyot' ('business flight'), 'biznes-prodvinutost' ('business progress'), 'biznes-trening' ('business training'), 'biznes-propovednik' ('business promoter'), 'biznes-professiya' ('business profession'), 'biznes-rezultat' ('business profits'), 'biznes-struktura' ('business structure'), 'biznes-trener' ('business coach'), 'biznes-turizm' ('business tourism'), 'mini-biznes' ('mini business'). In the sections that follow, borrowings from two semantic fields especially well-represented in the analyzed material are discussed in some detail.

3.1. Technology and computerization

Numerous examples of recent additions to Russian are words of English origin relating to computerization and technological development. Borrowings such as 'Internet' ('Internet'), 'kompyuter' ('computer'), 'printer' ('printer'), 'noutbuk' ('notebook') and 'sayt' ('site') are well-established in the Russian language. Such borrowings can be classified as necessary (cf. Mańczak-Wohlfeld 2006), as their appearance in the Russian lexicon is motivated by the absence of native lexemes that could be used in reference to the many technological devices that the speakers had a need to use in their everyday communication after *pierestroyka*.

The word 'Internet' is a good example of a foreign lexical item that has a huge word-formation potential. Sklyarevskaya (2006) lists 66 derivatives formed on the basis of this root by means of compounding and/or suffixation. In the material analyzed from Ogonyok for the purposes of this study, there are 28 derivatives of 'Internet', which attests to a high degree of assimilation of this root in the lexical system of contemporary Russian. On the other hand, according to Sklyarevskaya's (2006) dictionary, 'Internet' still has two spelling versions: one beginning with a capital, and the other, with a small letter. While according to the current rules of the Russian orthography, the word 'Internet' should properly be spelled capitalized, in the data from Ogonyok analyzed here the word and its derivatives are spelled more often with a small letter at the beginning.

Technological progress abounds in new inventions, which trigger the need for words that can be used in reference to them. This explains the recent importation into Russian of words belonging to the thematic field of the computers and the Internet, such as: 'adapter' ('adapter'), 'protssessor' ('processor'), 'mikroprotssessor' ('microprocessor'), 'blog' ('blog'), 'blogger' ('blogger'), 'veb-prostranstvo' ('web space'), 'fayl' ('file'), 'videofayl' ('video file'), 'virus' ('virus'), 'smartfon' ('smartphone'), 'imeyl' ('email'), 'esemeska' ('sms') and 'kommunikator' ('communicator').

A comparison of the graphic representation of these lexemes in the original language and the language of the recipient reveals that while some of

these borrowings have entered the language through the written medium accompanied by transliteration from English into the Cyrillic script (e.g., 'protessor', 'blogger'), others are either oral borrowings (e.g., 'imeyl', 'fayl'), or hybrids (e.g., 'videofayl'). Regardless the medium through which the borrowings have entered the target system, they are well-adapted to the inflectional system of the Russian language, e.g., the graphemic borrowing 'blogger' is inflected according to the paradigm of 'brat' ('brother'), just as the oral borrowing 'fayl' ('file').

3.2. Sport

Another lexical field into which the English language constantly provides new lexical items is sport. Apart from borrowings such as 'sport' ('sport'), 'sportsmen' ('sportsman'), 'sportsmenka' ('sportswoman') already existing in Russian, the analyzed material is peppered with words of English origin naming sports disciplines, e.g., 'basketbol' ('basketball'), 'beysbol' ('baseball'), 'bobsley' ('bobsleigh'), 'boks' ('box'), 'vindsyorfing' ('windsurfing'), 'voleybol' ('volleyball'), 'gandbol' ('handball'), 'pauerlifting' ('powerlifting'); sportspeople, e.g., 'beysbolist' ('ballplayer'), 'bobsleist' ('bobsleigher'), 'futbolist' ('footballer'), 'golkiper' ('goalkeeper'), 'chempion' ('champion'); and others, e.g., 'sportzal' ('gymnasium'), 'gol' ('goal'), 'mautinbayk' ('mountain bike'), 'doping' ('doping'), 'overtaym' ('overtime'), 'offsayd' ('offside').

While dictionaries may list the base without any derivatives or with one or two words derived from the given base, e.g., 'doping' is accompanied in Sklyarevskaya's dictionary by only one derivative, 'doping-kontrol' ('doping control'), the language of the press provides evidence that the newly-imported roots are productively recycled by the rules of lexical morphology. Two of the analyzed issues of *Ogonyok* discussed a scandal in the world of sport, referring to the use of anabolic substances among athletes. The number of derivatives based on the root 'doping' increased in these articles to ten items. Some of these derivatives were formed only for the sake of the articles concerned with the doping scandals, e.g., the compounds 'doping-mod'a' ('doping fashion') and 'doping-terrorizm' ('doping terrorism'), but suffixal derivatives clearly had been functioning much earlier in the spoken and written language as they can be found in dictionaries, e.g., adjectives 'dopingovyi' ('doping') (Krysin 2007: 270) and 'antidopingovyi' ('anti-doping') (Kuznetsov 2004: 41).

4. ENGLISH AS A LINGUA FRANCA OF THE SPEAKERS OF RUSSIAN?

Using words of English origin in one's native tongue is a general European phenomenon, which varies according to the openness of a given language to foreign words (cf. Romanov 2000). Referring to this statement, one can

say that Russian is especially prone to English influence, which is shown by the fact that the analysis of the material gathered from only 13 issues of *Ogonyok* made it possible to note about 700 words of English origin, including derivatives. However, as Rieger (1998) points out, there has been an extraordinary increase in the number of English borrowings into Russian in recent times: in the 18th and 19th centuries only about 100 anglicisms were recorded in Russian dictionaries. The openness to borrowing from English is supported by the fact that more than 30% of the borrowings in the analyzed material cannot be found in dictionaries (cf. Kuznetsov 2004, Sklyarevskaya 2006, Krysin 2007).

That the meaning of a few English borrowings was additionally explained in the texts analyzed here shows convincingly that the language used in *Ogonyok* reflects the current language used by its speakers. For example, the word ‘bumping’ in Russian was explained as denoting a special key used by burglars, a key that unblocks the lock easily, and also the very way of opening locks without damaging the locking mechanism. The context in which it was used in *Ogonyok* 40 (2008), p. 37, together with the explanation, is shown below:

- (1) [...] v posledneye vremya domushniki zamuchili operativnikov massovym vskrytiyem zamkov metodom bumpinga. Bumping – klyuch osoboy konstruktsyi, sposobnyi prizhymat shtifty i pruzhynki zamka. ‘[...] recently, burglars have completely exhausted the officers of the criminal department with picking locks on a large scale using the bumping method. Bumping (‘bump key’) is a special key designed for pressing the pins and springs of a lock.’

Another example is the word ‘bling-bling’, a current slang term, which appeared in an article concerned with jewelry and other ornaments (*Ogonyok* 50 (2008), p. 29), where it was explained as follows:

- (2) bling-bling – “to yest vsyo zvenyashcheye i blestyashcheye”
‘bling-bling – that is everything that glitters and jingles’

Sometimes a new name, which may be unfamiliar to the readers, is introduced and explained as a variety of something that the reader may already be familiar with, as in the following example from *Ogonyok* no 45 (2008), p. 18:

- (3) Zhena u nego [...] rabotayet v chyom-to tipa reklamy-dizayna-marketinga.
‘His wife [...] works in a type of advertising, design-marketing.’

It can be assumed that the meanings of the remaining borrowings have already sunk deep in the consciousness of Russian readers, which is demonstrated by the fact that words such as 'bobbi' ('policeman, cop'), 'brifing' ('briefing'), 'bukmeker' ('bookmaker'), 'defolt' ('default'), 'dzhekpot' ('jackpot'), 'isteblishment' ('establishment'), 'kilt' ('kilt'), 'middl-klass' ('middle class'), 'performans' ('performance') or 'praym-taym' ('prime time') do not come with any additional comments explaining their meaning.

The language of the press has its unique style and the journalists who use new borrowings in their articles on one hand count on the reader's familiarity with the words, and, on the other hand, assume that the meanings can be inferred from the context. This last case can be illustrated with the word 'praymeriz' ('primary election, primaries'), whose meaning is not explained explicitly, but the context unambiguously points to pre-elections in the USA and not anywhere else. In fact, Sklyarevskaya's (2006) dictionary includes in the lexical entry of 'praymeriz' information that this English borrowing can be used only in reference to pre-elections in the USA.

5. ADAPTATION PROCESSES

The semantic dimension of the lexical material analyzed from Ogonyok constitutes another interesting aspect of research into English borrowings into contemporary Russian. Borrowings can be systematized by comparing their meanings in the source and recipient languages. As is well-known, the meaning of a lexical item can undergo semantic change during borrowing, or its meaning may remain intact (cf. Mańczak-Wohlfled 2006). It turns out that Russian does not distinguish itself in this respect and borrows lexical items with or without any meaning changes.

The borrowing 'butsy' ('boots') is a good example of a word which has undergone a change of meaning; in addition, the word has undergone depluralization in the process of borrowing. As explained in Krysin (2007: 148), in Russian the word has a special type of football shoes in its denotation whereas in English, as explained by Bullon (2003: 162), the words 'boot' is used in reference to a type of shoe that covers one's whole foot and the lower part of one's leg. In other words, the word has undergone specialization of meaning during the process of borrowing into Russian. In addition, the English word 'boots' ('buts') is a plural form of the noun 'boot', where the suffix -s is a marker of plural number. In Russian, the singular stem contains -s and plural number is encoded with the native plural number suffix -y. In other words, the singular form of the lexeme in Russian ('butsa') is a result of depluralization. Furthermore, although the singular form of the English lexeme in question, i.e., 'boot', suggests classifying the noun with masculine gender upon its importation into Russian, in fact the noun is classified as feminine: 'eta butsa' ('this boot').

Also the word 'kasting' ('casting') has undergone specialization of meaning. It has only one meaning in Russian, i.e., "predvaritelnyi otbor devushek na konkursakh krasoty, aktyorov dla syomok filma ('elimination rounds in beauty pageants; the process of choosing the actors for a film or play')" (Sklyarevskaya 2006: 447, Krysin 2007: 344), whereas in English 'casting' has got one additional meaning, namely "an object made by pouring liquid metal, plastic, etc. into a mould" (Bullon 2003: 230). When it comes to the borrowing 'rok' ('rock'), its meaning has been narrowed even more, and in Russian it denotes only a type of music, whereas Bullon (2003) lists 10 meanings of this noun (including collocations and set phrases).

Also 'brifing' ('briefing') has changed its meaning. In Russian it is understood as "korotkaya press-konferentsiya po aktualnym voprosam tekushchei politiki ('a short press conference during which current political issues are discussed')" (Sklyarevskaya 2006: 158), whereas according to Bullon (2003: 182), 'briefing' means "information or instructions that you get before you have to do something". According to Crowther (1999: 138), 'briefing' in English is "a meeting for giving instructions or information to people". In contrast to the examples discussed above, the English lexeme 'briefing' has been borrowed into Russian with a shift of meaning.

On the other hand, the word 'bestseller' is an example of a borrowing which is undergoing generalization of meaning. Dictionaries of English define the word 'bestseller' as denoting a product (especially a book) enjoying great popularity and frequently bought (cf. Bullon 2003: 129). Sklyarevskaya (2006: 121) supplements this information by mentioning that the product is sold in a big number of copies – undoubtedly, this borrowing can be used while talking about a popular book. However, in the material from Ogonyok analyzed in this study, the word 'bestseller' occurred in a completely different context, namely in relation to a new model of Nano car. As can be expected from the discussion in section 4 above, the word was first used in inverted commas to alert the reader to an innovation in the word's use (Ogonyok 49 (2008), p. 25):

- (4) 'Yesli Nano poyavitsya v Rossii, to imeyet vse shansy stat nastoyashchim "bestsellerom": khotya, sudya po soglasheniyu s Minekonomrazvitiya, tsena Nano v Rossii vyrastyot do 3 tysyach dollarov, konkurentov u nego net'.

'If Nano appears in Russia, it has all the chance of becoming a real "best-seller": although it may be expected in view of the agreement reached with the Ministry for Economic Development that its price will rise to 3,000 dollars, it still will have no competitors.'

6. CONCLUSION

On the basis of the research material analyzed here it can be concluded that new lexical items of English origin are easily accepted by Russian speakers and easily find their place in the system of Russian, not only at the level of spelling, but also at the level of word-formation and inflection, adapting to the requirements of the Russian morphosyntax. The recent upsurge in the number of new words which have been imported from English into Russian in the wake of *perestroika* points to a constant need for new vocabulary items, which either serve as names of new phenomena or objects, or replace existing lexemes which are vague or ambiguous. As the analysis of relatively recent empirical material collected from the 2008 editions of a popular magazine (*Ogonyok*) has demonstrated, Russian is always open to new material that can enrich its insufficient lexical resources. The international character of English, its popularity and status in worldwide economy, politics, science and technology, certainly support the view that its lexicon will keep enriching not only Russian, but many other languages spoken in and outside Europe.

SOURCES

- Bullon, S. (ed.). (2003). *Longman dictionary of contemporary English*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.
- Crowther, J. (ed.). (1999). *Oxford advanced learner's dictionary of current English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Krysin, L. P. (ed.). (2007). *Tolkovy slovar inoyazychnykh slov*. Moscow: Eksmo.
- Kuznetsov, S. A. (ed.). (2004). *Bolshoy tolkovyi slovar russkogo yazyka*. Saint Petersburg: Norint.
- Ogonyok* 2008 (40)-(52).
- Sklyarevskaya, G.N. (ed.). (2006). *Tolkovy slovar russkogo yazyka nachala XXI veka. Aktualnaya leksika*. Moscow: Eksmo.

REFERENCES

- Gdowska, B. (2005). Iz nablyudeniya nad izmeneniyami nekotorykh slov, zaimstvovannykh iz angliyskogo yazyka, v russkoyazychnoy presse na Ukraine. In M. Vuytovich (ed.). *Issledovaniya po leksikologii i grammatike russkogo yazyka*. Poznań: Uniwersytet im. Adama Mickiewicza. Wydział Neofilologii. 37-45.
- Krysin, L. P. (1997). Zaimstvovaniye inoyazychnoi leksiki. In E.N. Shyryayev (ed.). *Russkiy yazyk*. Opole: Uniwersytet Opolski. Instytut Filologii Polskiej. 107-

119.

Mańczak-Wohlfeld, E. (2006). Angielsko-polskie kontakty językowe. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.

Rieger, J. (1998). Z dziejów języka rosyjskiego. Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Szkolne i Pedagogiczne.

Romanov, A. Yu. (2000). Anglitsizmy i amerikanizmy v russkom yazyke i otnosheniye k nim. Saint Petersburg: Izdatelstvo Sankt-Petersburgskogo Universiteta.

Krzysztof Ozga

Jagiellonian University in Krakow

МОЯ ВАЯФ YUZAET VINDOZU. AN ANALYSIS OF SELECTED ENGLISH BORROWINGS IN STANDARD AND SLANG RUSSIAN

STRESZCZENIE

Przedstawione studium jest próbą analizy sposobów funkcjonowania wybranych grup zapożyczeń angielskich w rosyjskim współczesnym slangu młodzieżowym. Autor opisuje wybrane przykłady adaptacji fonetycznych, słowotwórczych i fleksyjnych, jakim ulegają angielskie wyrazy zanurzone w środowisku językowym o innym typie morfologii i grafemiki, próbując jednocześnie odpowiedzieć na pytania dotyczące statusu „językowej przynależności” tych jednostek w kontekście „lingwistycznego prawa własności”.

1. INTRODUCTION

The aim of this study is to analyze selected features of English borrowings into Russian. The analysis focuses on some of the ways in which English words and expressions are exploited by the Russian youth of today. Young Russians have a propensity for “stealing” bits and bobs of the English language and running them through the cogs and wheels of the derivational and inflectional machinery of their own vernacular. Considered from the point of view of “ownership”, large-scale borrowing from English into Russian raises a number of interesting questions, including the following: 1) Can we trace the Englishness in the “embezzled” and adapted linguistic elements in a foreign language (e.g., Russian)?, 2) Do these imported lexical items belong to the target language?, and 3) Should there be any limitations on what appears to be excessive borrowing and if so, who can/should impose them?

The analysis is mostly lexicographically-driven, since I collected the empirical material from three recent dictionaries of Russian slang: Markunas (2003), Mokienko and Nikitina (2005), and Yelistratov (2006), consulting search engines and language corpora (*Natsional'nyy korpus russkogo yazyka*) only occasionally. I focused mainly on the first of the above-mentioned dictionaries, as it seems to be the most interesting source of empirical material as far as English borrowings into Russian slang are concerned: about two hundred loanwords were extracted from it and are analyzed here.

2. ANALYSIS OF THE EMPIRICAL MATERIAL

As is well-known, borrowings can be divided into various classes based on the generally acknowledged classificatory criteria (cf. Haugen 1950, Mańczak-Wohlfeld 1992, 1994, 2005, 2006, Walczak 2001, Arabski 2007). For the purpose of this study I selected four groups of borrowings which I found worth focusing on despite, or perhaps, owing to the fact that they do not necessarily fit neatly into the recognized schemata. The criteria according to which the examples were grouped are provided in the course of the analysis: it should be remembered that it is the loanwords (foreign words, borrowings) used by young Russians that are focused on here.¹

2.1. Unnecessary borrowings

The first group of examples are instances of unnecessary borrowings (cf. Mańczak 1995: 19), i.e., foreign words with native counterparts that are well-established in the target language, i.e., Russian:²

- (1) vayf [вайф] (E 'wife', SR 'zhena')
- (2) ayk [айк] (E 'icon', SR 'ikona')
- (3) bablgam [бابلгам] (E 'bubblegum', SR 'zhevatel'naya rezinka', 'zhvachka')
- (4) vok [вок] (E 'walk', SR 'gulyat')

¹ Compare the contemporary Polish of young people as described by Ożóg (2007: 240). See also Djakov (2003) who sees 'expressiveness of novelty' as one of the factors which tempts young Russians to use English words frequently: "expressiveness of novelty is one of the sound reasons for borrowing English words as more prestigious, significant, distinctive. English loanwords have an advantage over their Russian synonyms in the sense that they place the speaker higher on the social ladder, they emphasize his or her informative credibility and they aspire to be an index of superiority of the young people who use them [translation mine]."

² To demonstrate the graphemic adaptation, the analyzed loanwords are provided in Cyrillic in square brackets. RS stands for 'Russian slang', SR stands for 'Standard Russian'.

- (5) baki [баки] (1. E 'bucks', 'dollars'; SR 'dollary', 2. E 'any money/currency', SR 'den'gi')³
- (6) banda [банда] (E 'band', 'rock band', 'musical group', SR 'ansambl')
- (7) bas [бас] (E 'bus', SR 'avtobus')
- (8) boy [бой] (E 'boy', 'a young man', SR 'mal'chik', 'paren', 'podrostok')⁴
- (9) boss [босс] (E 'boss', 'superior', SR 'nachal'nik', 'zaveduyushchiy')
- (10) brazer [бразер] (E 'brother', SR 'brat')
- (11) british [бритиш] (1. E 'a British/English person (invariable N)', SR 'britanets', 'anglichanin'; 2. E 'British', 'English' (invariable Adj); SR 'britanskiy', 'angliyskiy')
- (12) beg [бэг] (E 'bag', SR 'sumka')
- (13) bed [бэд/бед] (E 'bed', SR 'krovat', 'postel')
- (14) bag [баг] (E 'bug', SR 'nasekomoe')
- (15) bek [бэк], beksayd [бэксайд] (E 'back (N)', 'backside',⁵ 2. 'back (Adv)', SR 'zadnitsa', 'nazad', 'obratno');
- (16) vayn [вайн] (E 'wine', SR 'vino')
- (17) botl/batl/botla/batla [ботл/батл/ботла/батла] (E 'a bottle of vodka', SR 'butylka')
- (18) vayt [вайт] (invariable), vaytovyy [вайтovýй] (variable) (E 'white', SR 'belyy')
- (19) men [мэн] (E 'man', SR 'muzhchina')

While the above loanwords might seem redundant from the point of view of lexical semantics, their presence in the language of young Russians is motivated by pragmatic and stylistic factors. The English borrowings in question belong to the expressive layer of the vocabulary, their markedness revealed by their use to 'sound cool', as is frequently the case of young people's speech, and by certain evaluative overtones that enrich their lexical meaning compared both with their English counterparts and already existing native cognates. For example, while both 'men' and 'muzhchina' ('man') have the same extensions, the former is used either to show approval or disapproval of manly qualities. In contrast to the English word 'boss', in Russian slang 'boss' is used for 'a bossy person' to encode irony and to discredit a person who behaves like a boss but in fact is not one. Thus, the extension of the English original and the Russian borrowing differ. The expressive notions that enrich their lexical meaning are the vehicle for their emotive-evaluative speech act function (cf. Awdiejew 2004: 115 ff). As a result, such borrowings are quasi-unnecessary rather than truly redundant.

³ Cf. RS 'kapusta', 'bablo', 'babki', 'babosy', 'tugriki', 'zelen', etc.

⁴ Cf. SR 'boy' meaning 'fight' or 'struggle'.

⁵ The back part of the body; e.g., 'Pryamo mne beksaydom na ruku sel.' ('He planted his backside right on my hand.').

The pragmatic and stylistic effect is also achieved through grammatical anomalies, e.g., 'vok' ('walk') illustrated in (4) is a verb which retains its original grammatical characteristics when used in a Russian sentence, i.e., it does not bear any native inflectional morphology. As shown in the example below, the verb does not have the native infinitive suffix required in the context of the modal auxiliary verb 'moch' ('to be able to'):

- (20) Ne mogu ya vok po takomu kholodu.
'I cannot *walk* when it is so cold outside.'

On the other hand, the verb 'vok' ('walk') is adapted at the levels of spelling and phonology. The Cyrillic notation contains the letter 'b', which represents the English letter 'w', but which is pronounced in Russian as 'v'. As 'vok' ('walk') is partly a graphemic borrowing, it is barely possible for a native speaker of English to recognize this word as being of English origin.⁶ Unlike the verb 'vok', the invariable adjective 'british' ('British') shown in (11) is morphologically well-adapted: it constitutes the base for derivatives with the target language adjectivizing suffixes '-sk', '-ov', e.g., 'britishovskiy' ('British'), 'britishovyy' ('British'), where redundancy occurs not only between the rival items for 'British', namely 'british' and 'britanskiy', but also within the derivational nest itself. 'Britishovskiy' ('British') and 'britishovyy' ('British') denote the same concepts as 'british' and 'britanskiy': the adjectivizing suffixes '-sk' and '-ov', perform only a formal function while being pleonastic from the lexical semantic point of view.⁷ At the same time, the spelling of 'british' ('British') follows the Russian rules of orthography, which demonstrates that it is well-adapted at the graphemic level.

The loanword 'botl' 'bottle of vodka' in (17) is a special case that can be analyzed as an instance of metonymic modification that has occurred during the process of borrowing: unlike 'bottle', 'botl' does not denote any bottle, but only a 'bottle of vodka'. Thus, there is a metonymic reduction within the sphere of substances that can be stored in this particular container (cf. Awdiejew and Habrajska 2004: 303-304). Moreover, the reduction illustrated by 'botl' seems to attest to the role of short-hands in the oral style, especially in slang.

The process of semantic change and adaptation of the loanword 'bag' ('bug') shown in (14) above is particularly noteworthy: the primary meaning of the word is attained in Russian slang from the sense of the word 'bug' that embraces "a fault in the system of instructions that operates a computer" (Bullon 2003: 192), which in English is a secondary meaning of this word. The sense of 'a small insect', the primary sense of 'bug' in English'

⁶ Cf. also 'vayt' ('wait'), 'vayf' ('wife'), 'vayn' ('wine').

⁷ Already here we can observe the derivational potential of the loanwords, also illustrated in the fourth group of examples discussed in section 2.4.

is added only later, as a secondary meaning of the word 'bag' ('bug') in Russian slang, as illustrated in Fig. 1 below:

English:	bug ₁ (insect) → bug ₂ (computer language) →
Russian slang:	bag [баг] ₁ (computer language) → bag [баг] ₂ (insect)

Fig.1. The process of semantic change in 'bag' ('bug').

2.2. Borrowings involving semantic shift, metonymy or metaphor

The second group recognized here comprises words which, being oral borrowings, are easily recognizable as English loanwords; at the same time these words carry different meanings compared to their English source lexemes, as illustrated below:

- (21) vaucher [ваучер] (E 'voucher', RS 1. 'male sexual organ' 2. 'unreliable untrustworthy partner')
- (22) khobby [хоббы] (E 'hobby', RS 'male sexual organ')
- (23) sponsor [спонсор] (E 'sponsor', RS 1. 'a rich lover' 2. 'male sexual organ' 3. 'a condom')
- (24) gamburger [гамбургер] (E 'hamburger', RS 'a foreigner, usually one from a West European country')
- (25) Blek sabbat [Блэк саббат] (E 'Black Sabbath', RS 1. 'subbotnik', 2. 'officially announced working Saturdays after the introduction of a five-day working week')

The first three examples fall within the semantic category SEX and lexicalize the concept of MALE SEXUAL ORGAN.⁸ A comparison between the meanings of the English source words and the meanings of the borrowings into Russian slang reveals obvious semantic differences between the compared items. The sense extensions involved in the above examples arise from metaphorical or metonymic manipulation of the original meanings that are characterized by various degrees of transparency. Perhaps the least transparent example is 'vaucher' [ваучер] in (21). Here the original word 'voucher' is projected from the source domain ('voucher') onto the target domain ('male sexual organ') and secondarily onto its owner, based on the association of the lack of reliance/reliability: both man and the biological symbol of maleness are regarded as untrustworthy (from the perspective of the opposite sex). Also 'khobby' [хоббы] ('male sexual organ') in (22) can be explicated via metonymy combined with metaphor: the domain of enjoyable activity is restricted to activity associated with the male organ, and linked to the organ

⁸ This category is quite prolific in Russian. Michałowski (2009) describes about 350 terms within the category MALE SEXUAL ORGAN, which is represented by about 3,000 items altogether, including derivatives.

itself. The borrowing 'sponsor' [спонсор] shown in (23) involves a change of its original meaning ('a person (...) that supports someone by paying for their training, education, living costs, etc'; Bullon 2003: 1598) to 'a person paying for sexual activity or services'; its second and third meaning are examples of a different kind of metonymy, synecdoche (WHOLE-FOR-PART), which involves reference to the person with names of entities that can be taken to be their 'parts', i.e., their male organ and the associated protective device.

Occasionally, the meanings are unexpected from the point of view of our cultural knowledge, e.g., 'gamburger' [гамбургер] in (24) denotes a foreigner, usually one from a West European country (but not from the U.S.); it is an excellent example of metonymy, where FOOD stands for MAN who eats it. On the whole we would expect it to be used in reference to Americans, as this fast-food is commonly associated with the USA rather than with any other foreign country.

'Blek sabbat' [Блэк саббат], literally 'black Saturday', is an interesting loanword in that *Black Sabbath*, being the name of a famous heavy metal band, is associated with heavy metal music, while the meanings of the borrowing in Russian slang indicated in (25) have arisen through a play on the native Russian word 'subбота' 'Saturday' (dating back to Old Russia) and 'sabbat'. Incidentally, 'subbotnik' is a Russian word also used in English to denote the hypocritical phenomenon of the practice or an act of working "voluntarily" on a Saturday, for the benefit of the collective, connected with the Soviet era (Kaplan 1968: 359).

2.3. Rhyming expressions

The third group comprises loanwords which are used in rhyming constructions functioning as sayings or catchy phrases. They are referred to in the literature as *reduplicative words*, *rhyme combinations*, *echo compounds* or *rhyme tags* (Sobkowiak 1991: 160). I have selected three amusing examples:

(26) Rashn sam sebe strashen [Рашн сам себе страшен].

'A Russian person is a threat to him/herself'

(27) Dazhe klevyy shtatskiy zipper propuskaet russkiy tripper [Даже клёвый штатский zipper пропускает русский триппер].

'Even an excellent American zipper lets in Russian gonorrhea'

(28) O'key – skazal ded Mokey [О'кей – сказал дед Мокей].

'Ok, – said grandpa Mokey.'

'Rashn sam sebe strashen' in (26) is a perfect example of a vowel reduction overlap, which does not occur in Polish borrowings from English. Both Russian and English are languages with strong reduction of unstressed vowels. The /ə/ or /i/ (in Russian 'shva s tochkoj') as well as vowel elision constitute the basis for this reduplicative compound: /raʃ^{və}n/ and /straʃ^{və}n/. This rhym-

ing expression can be interpreted as 'all misfortunes that happen to the Russians are their own fault'.

The rhyme combination in (27) functions as an emotive-evaluative speech act (cf. Awdiejew 2004: 115 ff) to show disapproval of something of poor quality or of something that is going to prove useless. It is founded on the metaphor whose source domain is the OBJECT OF SEXUAL INTEREST and the target domain is the OBJECT WORTH SOMEONE'S INTEREST. 'Zipper' carries the association with SEX while 'tripper' (Russian for 'gonorrhea') implies a combination of SEX and FAILURE. Thus, this combination can be considered as resulting from a kind of 'cooperation' of the semantic and phonological planes of the lexemes 'zipper' and 'tripper': their meanings are linked via the presented metaphor while their phonological structures overlap, being differentiated only by their onset consonants /z/ and /tr/.

The rhyme combination in (28) is a set phrase used to show agreement or approval. The English loanword 'o'key' rhymes with 'ded Mokey', a character from a popular children's TV program.⁹ The reference brings about infantilization of the expressed approval, which, when combined with the nursery rhyme, lends an air of irony to the phrase.

2.4. Morphological (inflectional and derivational) adaptation

The fourth group of borrowings into which the empirical material studied here was divided comprises contaminations with varying degrees of inflectional and derivational adaptation (cf. Mańczak-Wohlfeld 1992: 20-23). Some representative examples are provided below:

(29) ayovshchina [айовщина] (E 'inhabitants of Iowa', SR 'Americans')
michiganshchina [мичиганщина] (E 'inhabitants of Michigan', SR 'Americans')

(30) May-Klyukha [Май-Клюха] (E 'Michael Jackson')

(31) vinda [винда],

vin'doza [вин'доза]

vindo'za [виндо'за]

vindouza [виндоуза]

vindoza [виндоза]

vindusyatina [виндусятина],

vyn' [вынь]

vindy [винды]

(E 'Windows')

vindusyatnik [виндусятник]

vindusyatnik [виндусятник]

(E 'a user of Windows')

⁹ The original TV program was called *Skazki dedushki Mokeya*; later the name was changed to *V gostyakh u dedushki Mokeya*.

- (32) obkhayrat' [обхайрать] (E 'to cut sb's hair', SR 'podstrich')
 obkhayrat'sya [обхайраться] (E 'to have one's hair cut', SR 'podstrich'sya')
- (33) oprikevat' [оприкевать] (E 1. 'go mad', 2. 'be in awe'; SR 1. 'soyti s uma',
 2. 'byt' pod sil'nym vpechatleniem ot chego-l.')

In the examples illustrated in (29), English roots 'Iowa' and 'Michigan' are combined with the suffix '-shchin' on the derivational model for 'ryazanshchina', i.e., 'ryazan+-shchin(a)' (E 'Ryazan and/or its inhabitants (pej.)'). The meaning change is again founded on metonymy, and for concreteness, on synecdoche: STATE stands for the whole COUNTRY, as the loanwords do not denote the particular states ('Iowa', 'Michigan') nor their citizens, but all Americans.

Example (30) illustrates a morphemic overlap – the root 'Michael' overlaps with the root 'klyukh' ('chum') and the border of the overlap makes the suffix '-ukh' prominent. The suffix carries an expressive-diminutive meaning by analogy to the model on which nouns like 'Vanyukha', 'Verukha' are derived from native proper names ('Vanya', 'Vera'), hence 'may klyukha' (literally: 'my chum') is a hypocorism.

The adaptation of the trade name 'Windows' shows that young Russians do not hesitate to exploit the segmental, prosodic, inflectional and derivational capacity of their language. The name of the operating system in Russian slang either retains the English diphthong /əʊ/ in 'vindouza' or undergoes monophthongization in 'vindoza' (which is justifiable because of the strong labiality of the Russian vowel 'o', which is nearly diphthongal itself). The dynamic Russian stress makes it possible to accent either the penultimate syllable or the last one: 'vin'doza' vs. 'vindo'za'. All forms except for one are of feminine gender but even they display some diversity in declension: 'vinda', 'vindoza', 'vindouza', 'vindusyatina' inflect for case according to the first declension while 'vyn' inflects according to the third declension (cf. Lachur 2002: 70, 76); only 'vindy' is a *plurale tantum* noun.

Similarly to 'vindusyatnik' ('Windows user'), 'vinduzyatnik' ('Windows user') in (31), examples (32) and (33) demonstrate the high derivational capacity of Russian, which adds a wide variety of derivational affixes to the borrowed roots – 'hair' and 'prick' in (32) and (33), respectively. The three words 'oprikevat'', 'obkhayrat'', 'obkhayrat'sya' contain a native Russian prefix, thematic suffix, infinitival suffix; in addition, 'obkhayrat'sya' contains an anti-causative reflexive suffix in its morphological structure:

Table 1. The derivational structure of the selected morphologically adapted words

prefix	root	thematic suffix	infinitival suffix	postfix
o-	-prik- (E ‘prick’)	-eva-	-t’	--
ob-	-khayr- (E ‘hair’)	-a-	-t’	--
ob-	-khayr- (E ‘hair’)	-a-	-t’-	-sya

The derivational power of Russian exercised on loanwords was investigated by Jochym-Kuszklikowa (2008), who analyzed derivational nests founded on the following lexemes: ‘ask’, ‘drink’, ‘fuck’, ‘use’, ‘game’ and ‘crazy’ and found that Russians make use not only of native affixes but also of foreign ones. She comments on the derivatives of the verb ‘fuck’ in the following way:

Although Russian youth slang has been entered by English words that are founded on the offensive slang base *fuck*, the derivational nest in which we find also foreign formatives functions independently, preserving only the essential shades of the semantics of the original word [translation mine]. (Jochym-Kuszklikowa 2008: 99)

To illustrate the high degree of adaptation of English lexical roots as well as affixes and the productivity with which such resources are exploited in the Russian lexicon, let us look at the derivatives of ‘fuck’ (cf. Jochym-Kuszklikowa 2008: 99-101, 106):

(34) verbal derivatives:

- fakat’ [факать] (E ‘fuck’, RS ‘to have sex’)
- fakat’sya [факаться] (RS ‘to do something for a long time, to be slack-ing off’ (pej.))
- faknut’ [факнуть] (RS ‘to have sexual intercourse (once)’)
- otfachit’ [отфачить] (RS 1. ‘to have sex with sb’ 2. ‘to rudely tell sb off, to chase sb away’)
- ostofachit’ [остофачить] (RS ‘become boring’)
- podfaknut’sya [подфакнуться] (RS ‘to use an opportunity to have sex’)
- podfakivat’sya [подфакиваться] (RS ‘to incline sb to enter into an inti-mate sexual relationship’)
- pofakat’ [пофакать] (RS ‘to have sex on several occasions/to engage in sex intercourse over a period of time’)
- prifakivat’sya [прифакиваться] (RS ‘to chat up a girl with the hope of entering into an intimate sexual relationship’)

- vyfakivat'sya [выфакиваться] (RS 1. 'to be aggressive towards sb', 2. 'to be getting into conflict with sb')
- zafakat' [зафакать], zafachit' [зафачить] (RS 'to be a real bore, a drag', 2. 'to wind sb up')
- zafakat' sya [зафакаться] (RS 1. 'to get dirty' 2. 'to get confused by sth')
- (35) adjectival derivatives:
- fakannyu [факанный] (RS 'very bad, awful')
- fakanutyu [факанутый], faknutyu [факнутый] (RS 'abnormal, insane')
- (36) nominal derivatives:
- fak [фак] (RS 1. 'the sex act' 2. 'anything that refers to sex')
- fakt [факт] (RS 'the sex act')
- faking [факинг]– (RS 'something revolting')
- fakalo [факало], fakel [факел], fakt [факт] (RS 'male sex organ')
- faker [факер], fakmen [факмен] (RS 'a promiscuous man, one who likes to get laid')
- fakushnik [факушник], faker [факер], fakar' [факарь] (RS 'a woman-izer')
- fakukha [факуха], fakushka [факушка] (RS 1. 'a prostitute', 2. 'a mistress', 3. 'any woman')
- fakusha [факуша] (RS 'any woman')
- faki [факи] – (RS 'swear words', 'four-letter words')
- fak [фак] (RS 'exclamation of disgust, anger, or annoyance')

The examples listed in (34)-(36) include three allomorphs of the root: /fak/, /fak'/, /fatʃ'/ and the following native and foreign derivational affixes (Tables 2 and 3, respectively):

Table 2: Native derivational affixes in the Russian derivational nest founded on 'fuck'.

verbal derivatives		
prefix	suffix	postfix
ot- pod- po- pri- vy- za-	-a- -nu- -i- -yva-/iva-	-sya
adjectival derivatives		
prefix	suffix	postfix
--	-nn- -t-	--

nominal derivatives		
prefix	suffix	postfix
--	-Ø- -al- -ush- -nik- -ar'- -ukh- -k-	--

Table 3: Foreign derivational affixes in the Russian derivational nest founded on ‘fuck’.

nominal derivatives	
prefix	suffix
--	-ing- -er- -men-

It is worth noting that English affixes appear only in borrowed nouns (‘faker’, ‘faking’), whereas both verbal and adjectival derivatives include native affixes (almost) exclusively. The item ‘fakmen’ is derived with ‘-men’, which Jochym-Kuszlukowa (2008: 99-100) analyzes as a suffix deriving the complex noun in Russian. In all the nests founded on ‘ask’, ‘drink’, ‘fuck’, ‘use’, ‘game’ and ‘crazy’ analyzed by Jochym-Kuszlukowa (2008) no verb is derived with the help of a foreign affix and only a single adjective ‘yuzabel’nyy’ [юзабельный] (‘usable’) contains an English affix in its morphological structure, the suffix *-able*. According to Shvedova (2005: 330) ‘-abel’n-’ (‘useful, having the ability to perform the action denoted by the derivational base’) is a result of the fusion of the English ‘-able’ and the native Russian suffix ‘-n-’. The suffix began to be productive in Russian several decades ago, combining both with borrowed foreign and native verbal roots (e.g., ‘komfortabel’nyy’ [комфортабельный] (‘comfortable’), ‘rentabel’nyy’ [рентабельный] (‘profitable’), ‘transportabel’nyy’ [транспортабельный] (‘transportable’), ‘chitabel’nyy’ [читабельный] (‘readable’), as observed by Tikhonov (1985a: 462) and Tikhonov (1985b: 36, 254, 379), and thus its novelty status is disputable.

Among the derivatives in (34)-(36) there are also two examples of blending: 1) the word ‘fakt’ (‘the sex act’) in (36) is a result of the amalgamation of ‘fuck’ and ‘act’; 2) the word ‘ostofachit’ (‘become boring’) in (34) is a combination of ‘osto-’ from ‘ostoletit’ (‘become boring’) and ‘fachit’ (a bound verbal formation based on ‘fak’ (cf. the prefixed verbs ‘ot-fachit’, ‘za-fachit’ in (34)), which reinforces the emotive value of the first component of the

blend.¹⁰ Blending – a situation whereby phonetic fragments of two (or more) basic words are put together to make a single lexeme (Szymanek 1998: 99) – is a word-manufacturing mechanism which does not belong to the derivational means normally employed in creating new words in Russian. The use of this mechanism shows that young Russians experiment with language not only by adding native or foreign affixes to the adapted foreign roots, but also by implementing word-manufacturing means from outside the derivational repertoire of their own language.¹¹

The word 'fakel' ('male sex organ') listed in (36) is a separate case. The original meaning of the Russian word 'fakel', an old borrowing from German (cf. Dal' n.d.) is 'torch'. The secondary meaning discussed here has probably been coined on the basis of the phonological overlap of the words 'fakel' and 'fak' which triggered the semantic association of 'torch' and 'male sex organ' by reference to the shape of these instruments.

3. FINAL REMARKS

In this paper I have examined a selection of recent borrowings from English into Russian slang, focusing on the adaptation processes that accompany the process of borrowing by the young generation belonging to a culture that promotes enrichment of its lexical resources with the help of foreign roots and affixes, who speak a language which shows remarkable flexibility in adapting the new lexical material to the strictures of its graphemic, phonetic, phonological, morphological, semantic as well as pragmatic rules. The remarkable "freedom" that can be observed even with a single lexical root, illustrated here with the recent borrowing 'vindouza'/'vindoza' ('Windows') and 'fakat' 'to fuck', raises questions about the right of ownership in language and culture. The question whether English words that are borrowed into Russian and undergo diverse processes of adaptation at both the grammatical, i.e., grapho-phonological, derivational and inflectional plane, and the semantic/pragmatic plane still belong to the source language cannot be

¹⁰ Jochym-Kuszlikowa (2008: 99-101, 106) does not include 'ostofachit' ('become boring') in the derivational nest; however, this word is recorded in Yelistratov (2006: 265). The first component of the blending 'ostoletit' ('become boring') is derived from 'stoletie' ('century'), whose long duration evokes associations with tediousness and monotony.

¹¹ Blending has recently started conquering the Russian language; still, its outcomes are often treated by Russian linguists as calques from English (e.g., 'trudogolik' [трудоголик] 'workaholic'), compounds (interfixations, e.g., 'trud-o-golik'; '-o'- being an interfix, 'trud-' and '-golik' being derivational bases) or suffixations (where '-golik' in 'trudogolik' is regarded as a borrowed suffix); however, some Russian researchers are inclined to classify such formations as blends (cf. Lavrova 2010: 230).

answered unambiguously. The indeterminacy may be overcome if we do not take the view that language is separate from its users, but rather see language and its speakers as related synecdochically (PART-FOR-WHOLE) and invoke the synecdoche LANGUAGE FOR THE CULTURE THAT SUSTAINS IT/ITS SPEAKERS. Looked at from this angle, language as a non-living entity cannot 'own', 'possess', 'have' or 'come into possession of something' in the primary sense of these expressions. It is only *language users* who can be owners and thus it is not unreasonable to ask who "owns" a particular lexical item, e.g., is 'khobby' [хобби] written in Cyrillic an English word? Is it Russian? Is it English when used as denoting a pastime and Russian when denoting the male sex organ?

As indicated by the question 'Whose language is it anyway?', the issue of ownership is of particular relevance to English, the lingua franca of the contemporary world, since so many of its words "have gone abroad", have been "embezzled" and – like plasticine – have been shaped to denote something else. However, the primary function of language is communication and languages belong to the people(s) who use them for communication – as long as they serve their speakers, the question of ownership is fortunately not legal, but academic. Since no linguistic system provides its users with sufficient means to fulfil all their ever-changing communicative needs, as observed already by Roman Jakobson (cf. Mańczak-Wohlfeld 2010: 14-15), borrowing should be seen not as a factor that contributes to the deterioration of language, but rather as a means for providing its speakers with a tool enhancing effective communication. In addition, as shown in the present analysis of Russian slang, borrowing also manifests the human need to experiment with language and reflects directly the creative potential of language.

SOURCES

- Bullon, S. (2003). *Longman dictionary of contemporary English*. Harlow: Pearson Education Ltd.
- Daľ, V., *Tolkovyy slovar' zhivogo velikorusskogo yazyka (Sovremennoe napisanie slov). Republikatsiya vypolnena na osnove II izdaniya (1880-1882 gg.)*. [online] <http://vidahl.agava.ru>, [20.12.2010].
- Markunas, A. (2003). *Tolkovyy slovar' molodezhno-studencheskogo zhargona*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu Adama Mickiewicza.
- Natsional'nyy korpus russkogo yazyka. [online] <http://www.ruscorpora.ru>, [10.10.2009].
- Tikhonov, A. N. (1985a). *Slovoobrazovatel'nyy slovar' russkogo yazyka*, Vol. 1. Moskva: Russkiy Yazyk.
- Tikhonov, A. N. (1985b). *Slovoobrazovatel'nyy slovar' russkogo yazyka*, Vol. 2. Moskva: Russkiy Yazyk.

- Walter, H., Mokienko, V. M. Nikitina, G. T. (2005). *Tolkovyy slovar' russkogo shkol'nogo i studencheskogo zhargona*. Moskva: AST-Astrel'-Tranzitkniga.
- Yelistratov, V. S. (2006). *Tolkovyy slovar' russkogo slenga*. Moskva: AST-PRESS.

REFERENCES

- Arabski, J. (2007). General trends in language transfer studies. In J. Arabski (ed.). *Challenging tasks for psycholinguistics in the new century*. Katowice: Oficyna Wydawnicza WW. 11-21.
- Awdiejew, A. (2004). *Gramatyka interakcji werbalnej*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
- Awdiejew, A., Habrajska, G. (2004). *Wprowadzenie do gramatyki komunikacyjnej*, Vol 1. Łask: Leksem.
- Djakov, A. I. (2003). Prichiny intensivnogo zaimstvovaniya anglitsizmov v sovremennom russkom yazyke. [online] <http://www.philology.ru/linguistics2/dyakov-03.htm>, [14.03.2010].
- Haugen, E. (1950). The analysis of linguistic borrowing. In E.S. Firchow, K. Grimstad, N. Hasselmo and W.A. O'Neil (eds.). (1972). *Studies by Einar Haugen. Presented on the occasion of his 65th Birthday – April 19, 1971* (reprinted from *Language* 26: 210-231). The Hague: Mouton. 161-185.
- Jochym-Kuslikowa, L. (2008). K voprosu o gnezdom slovoobrazovanii v russkom molodezhnom slenge. Derivatsionnoe usvoenie anglitsizmov. In H. Chodurska (ed.). *Przeszłość i terażniejszość Rosji w świetle faktów językowych*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Akademii Pedagogicznej. 97-110.
- Kaplan, F. (1968). *Bolshevik ideology and the ethics of Soviet labor*. New York: Philosophical library.
- Lachur, Cz. (2002). *Współczesny język rosyjski. System gramatyczny (z ćwiczeniami)*. Opole: Drukmasz.
- Lavrova, N. A. (2010). Linguistic contamination: word-building peculiarities and stylistic functions. *International Journal of Arts and Sciences* 3(14): 223-230.
- Mańczak-Wohlfeld, E. (1992). *Analiza dekompozycyjna zapożyczeń angielskich w języku polskim*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
- Mańczak-Wohlfeld, E. (1994). *Angielskie elementy leksykalne w języku polskim*. Kraków: Universitas.
- Mańczak-Wohlfeld, E. (1995). *Tendencje rozwojowe współczesnych zapożyczeń angielskich w języku polskim*. Kraków: Universitas.
- Mańczak-Wohlfeld, E. (2006). *Angielsko-polskie kontakty językowe*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
- Mańczak-Wohlfeld, E. (2010). *Słownik zapożyczeń angielskich w polszczyźnie*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Michałowski, Ł. (2009). *Językowy obraz świata w żargonie młodzieżowym języka ukraińskiego i rosyjskiego na materiale słowa oznaczającego męski organ płciowy*. Jagiellonian University of Cracow unpublished MA thesis.

- Ożóg, K. (2007). *Polszczyzna przełomu XX i XXI wieku. Wybrane zagadnienia*. Rzeszów: Biblioteka Frazy.
- Shvedova, N. (2005). *Russkaya grammatika: nauchnye trudy*. Moskva: Institut russkogo yazyka im. V.V. Vinogradova RAN.
- Sobkowiak, W. (1991). *Metaphonology of English paronomasic puns*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Szymanek, B. (1998). *Introduction to morphological analysis*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Walczak, B. (2001). Kontakty polszczyzny z językami niesłowiańskimi. In J. Bartmiński (ed.). *Współczesny język polski*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej. 527-541.

Marcin Zabawa

University of Silesia, Katowice

**IS POLISH REALLY
BEING FLOODED WITH ENGLISH
BORROWINGS?
ON THE INFLUENCE OF ENGLISH
ON WRITTEN AND SPOKEN POLISH
(WITH SPECIAL EMPHASIS ON THE POLISH
SPOKEN BY POLES LIVING IN GREAT BRITAIN)**

STRESZCZENIE

Celem badania jest określenie danych ilościowych dotyczących wpływu współczesnego języka angielskiego na język polski (przede wszystkim na język Polaków mieszkających od niedawna w Wielkiej Brytanii). W tym celu autor zebrał korpus polszczyzny pisanej złożony z tekstów pisanych przez Polaków mieszkających w tym kraju. Korpus ten został następnie zanalizowany pod kątem pożyczek angielskich, ze szczególnym uwzględnieniem częstotliwości ich występowania. Wcześniej jednak zostały krótko przywołane wcześniejsze badania autora nad częstotliwością występowania pożyczek angielskich w języku polskim używanym w kraju (na bazie korpusu języka mówionego, złożonego ze spontanicznych rozmów przeprowadzonych w warunkach nieformalnych oraz na bazie korpusu języka pisanego ogólnego, złożonego z tekstów pochodzących z niespecjalistycznego forum internetowego). Dane uzyskane w niniejszym badaniu zostały następnie porównane z ww. badaniami przeprowadzonymi przez autora w przeszłości. Częstotliwość anglicyzmów w korpusach będących przedmiotem badań waha się (w kolejności malejącej) od 1,73% wszystkich słów korpusu (w przypadku korpusu będącego głównym przedmiotem niniejszego artykułu) poprzez 1,33% (w przypadku korpusu języka pisanego ogólnego), do 0,37% (w przypadku korpusu języka mówionego). Uzyskane wyniki wskazują, iż wpływ angielszczyzny na polszczyznę (zarówno tą używaną w kraju, jak i poza jego

granicami) jest zauważalny, jakkolwiek nie jest on aż tak znaczący, aby można było mówić o zalewaniu współczesnej polszczyzny przez anglicyzmy.

1. INTRODUCTION

It is a well-known fact that Polish, used both in the country and abroad, is lexically influenced by the English language. The number of English borrowings in standard (literary) Polish (and used in Poland) approximates 3,000 items (Mańczak-Wohlfeld 2010); many of them, however, belong to professional jargon, and are not really used in standard Polish, be it written or spoken, on a daily basis. On the whole, it may be stated that the use of English lexical borrowings in Polish, particularly written Polish, has been researched relatively thoroughly.¹ A different picture appears, however, when the borrowings of English origin in the language of the Poles that have recently migrated to Great Britain (following the entrance of Poland into the European Union in 2004) are taken into account. Although the influence of L2 on the native language (Polish) spoken by immigrants in L2 linguistic communities has been studied before (cf. Doroszewski 1938, Dubisz 1992, Grabowski 1988, Lewiński 2000, Błasiak 2008), most extant studies have been concerned with English borrowings in the language of the people who emigrated from Poland many years ago.² Consequently, the number of the borrowings used in the present-day language of the Poles living abroad is difficult to estimate.

The primary aim of the present paper will thus be to present some statistical data concerning the frequency of borrowings in the native language of Poles who have emigrated to Great Britain recently, hence monolingual speakers of Polish living in Great Britain. Additionally, the most frequent borrowings will be presented and discussed. The results will then be compared with the results of the other studies carried out by the present author concerning the frequency of English borrowings in spoken informal Polish on the basis of texts taken from informal spontaneous conversations (Zabawa 2006) and written informal Polish on the basis of the texts taken from the Internet message board not aimed at any particular group of people (Zabawa forthcoming). This procedure will enable us to compare the frequency of English borrowings in different varieties of Polish. First, however, some theoretical preliminaries, such as the definition of the very term *borrowing*, are in order.

¹ See, e.g., Mańczak-Wohlfeld (2006) and the bibliography therein.

² Besides, most of the studies mentioned here deal with the language of the Poles living in the United States, rather than Great Britain (with the exception of Błasiak 2008).

2. LANGUAGE CONTACT AND BORROWING DEFINED

Borrowings can be said to be the manifestation of a much wider phenomenon, namely *language contact*. Traditionally, *language contact* was defined as "the situation in which two or more languages coexist within one state and [...] the speakers use these different languages alternately in specific situations" (Bussman 1998: 260). *Language contact* is similarly defined by Crystal (2008: 107) as "a situation of geographical continuity or close social proximity (and thus of mutual influence) between languages or dialects." If we were to adopt this traditional view, we would have to admit that language contact may exist only in bi- or multilingual countries, such as e.g., Switzerland. However, language contact does not have to imply the coexistence of two or more languages within one state (cf. Mańczak-Wohlfeld 2006, Zabawa forthcoming). In fact, language contact may and does happen indirectly via satellite or cable television, the Internet, the press, books, and the process of teaching and learning foreign languages. English-Polish language contact is thus clearly evident in present-day Poland.³ The contact, as was said before, is manifested through the existence of *borrowings*: the borrowings are generally believed to be introduced by bilingual people; they have first the status of quotes, or unassimilated single-word code-switches, and only then are they repeated and adapted (or assimilated) to the recipient language and begin to be used by monolinguals or people not familiar with the donor language. Some borrowings, however, may never go beyond the stage of a quote and may never be used by monolingual speakers.⁴

The notion of *borrowing* is defined in various ways. For example, Chalker and Weiner (1994: 46), define it as "the taking over of a word from a foreign language; [also] a word so borrowed", thus restricting the process to only words. On the other hand, Crystal defines it in a much broader way:

a term used in comparative and historical linguistics to refer to a linguistic form being taken over by one language or dialect from another; such borrowings are usually known as loan words [...]. Less commonly, sounds and grammatical structures may be borrowed [...]. Crystal (2008: 58)

By using the notion of *linguistic forms* rather than just *words* Crystal points out that also whole structures (rather than just words) may be borrowed, which makes the definition broader than the previous one. A somewhat different definition was provided by Haugen (1950: 211): "the heart of

³ What is more, quite a few English borrowings were introduced in the previous centuries. See the monograph by Mańczak-Wohlfeld (1995), who discusses, among other things, the oldest English loans in Polish.

⁴ See Mańczak-Wohlfeld (1995) for details on how the English loans are introduced into Polish.

our definition is then the attempted reproduction in one language of patterns previously found in another". As Haugen uses the term *pattern*, like Crystal, he also stresses the fact that the process of borrowing is not restricted to individual words, but also larger units may be transferred from one language to the other one. The term *borrowing* can therefore refer not only to the sphere of lexicon (with which it is most easily associated), but also to the domains of semantics, syntax, morphology, phonology and pragmatics.

3. TYPOLOGY OF BORROWINGS

As observed in the previous section, borrowing is not a uniform phenomenon and therefore several subclasses of borrowings can be distinguished (Arabski 2004, Haugen 1950, Mańczak-Wohlfeld 1992, 1993, 1995, 2006, Weinreich 1974, Witalisz 2007, Zabawa 2004, 2005, 2009b, 2009c, forthcoming):

- lexical borrowings, e.g., Polish 'hot dog', 'skater/skejter', 'dealer/diler', 'drugi', 'sejwować'⁵ from English 'hot dog', 'skater', 'dealer', 'drugs', 'to save', respectively;⁶
- semantic borrowings, i.e., enrichment of the meaning of Polish words with new senses, e.g., addition of the sense of 'box' in computer register to 'okno' ('window'), addition of the sense of 'a small picture representing a person' in computer register to 'awatar' ('avatar'), transfer of the sense of 'a background picture on the computer screen' to 'tapeta' ('wallpaper');⁷
- morphological borrowings, e.g., the morpheme *e-* taken from 'e-mail' deriving 'e-książka'⁸ ('e-book'), 'e-biznes' ('e-business'), 'e-aukcje' ('e-auctions'), 'e-podpis' ('e-signature') (Zabawa 2004);⁹
- syntactic borrowings, e.g., the use of noun+noun clusters, e.g., 'auto naprawa' ('car repair'), 'komputer świat' ('computer world'), 'biznes spotkanie' ('business meeting') or the use of adjectives in the attributive

⁵ This is a form used in the field of computers, nowadays largely replaced by 'zapisać', e.g., 'zapisać plik' (lit. 'to write a file').

⁶ The present study is restricted to this type of borrowings. More examples of English lexical borrowings in Polish can be found in Mańczak-Wohlfeld's monograph (2006) and the dictionary of English borrowings (Mańczak-Wohlfeld 2010).

⁷ More examples of semantic borrowings can be found e.g., in Markowski (2000), Witalisz (2007), Zabawa (2004b, 2008).

⁸ The same meaning in Polish is sometimes also expressed by means of a lexical borrowing from English, 'e-book'.

⁹ This group may also include quasi-morphological borrowings, e.g., loan shifts formed with *-gate*, e.g., 'Rywingate' ('the Rywin scandal'), 'Begergate' ('the Beger scandal') (Kreja 1993, Mańczak-Wohlfeld 2006, Zabawa 2009c).

position instead of the postpositive one, e.g., 'komediowy serial' ('comedy series'), 'żeglarskie obozy' ('sailing camps') instead of 'serial komediowy', 'obozy żeglarskie' (Mańczak-Wohlfeld 1993, Otwinowska-Kasztelaniec 2000);¹⁰

- spelling borrowings, e.g., 'qmpela' (P 'kumpela', E 'mate/girlfriend'), 'tesh' (P 'też', E 'too'), 'loozik' (P 'luzik', E 'not to worry') (Zabawa 2009b);
- punctuation borrowings, e.g., the use of " " as quotation marks on the English model instead of the Polish „ ”, seen very frequently in various kinds of printed texts, including newspapers and magazines; the use of a dot instead of a comma in decimal fractions: '0.5' instead of '0,5', '3.5 cala' instead of '3,5 cala' ('3.5 inches') (Zabawa 2005);
- pragmatic borrowings, e.g., changes in compliment responses (Arabski 2004), use of the pronoun 'ty' ('you (informal)') instead of the formal forms of address 'pan' ('Sir/Mister'), 'pani' ('Madam'), seen especially in television quizzes and commercials.

Lexical borrowings, in turn, can also be further sub-classified (Haugen 1950, Weinreich 1974, Mańczak-Wohlfeld 1992) into several categories:

- loanwords, where both the form and meaning are borrowed, e.g., Polish 'gin/dżin' from English 'gin';
- loan blends (hybrids), where only a part of the form is of foreign origin, while the rest is native, e.g., 'sekssturystyka' ('sex tourism');¹¹
- loan translations (calques), where "they [i.e., the borrowers] have imported a particular structural pattern, viz. the combination of the two constituents into a compound expression with a new meaning of its own not derivable by a simple addition of the two parts" (Haugen 1950: 214), e.g., 'gorące klawisze' from English 'hot keys'.¹²

Loanwords, in turn, can be further differentiated, with various criteria being employed, for example:

- the degree of assimilation (Mańczak-Wohlfeld 1995, 2006): 1) unassimilated loans (quotes), e.g., 'fifty-fifty', 'non stop' used in Polish on the model of English; they are not inflected and their spelling remains English; 2) partly assimilated loans, i.e., words assimilated on some levels

¹⁰ It is also possible to treat morphological and syntactic borrowings as two subtypes of one group of grammatical borrowings.

¹¹ Formations of this kind are, however, relatively rare.

¹² Sometimes, however, the reproduction is not exact, e.g., 'drapacz chmur' (lit. 'cloud scraper' vs. 'skyscraper'). There is, however, a clear disagreement among linguists: Haugen, for example, classifies both semantic loans and loan translations within one group, termed *loan shifts* (Haugen 1950).

- (e.g., morphology), but not on the others (e.g., spelling), e.g., 'week-end'¹³; 3) assimilated loans, e.g., Polish 'sport' ('sport'), 'hokej' ('hockey'), 'import' ('import'), 'komputer' ('computer');
- the degree of necessity (Mańczak-Wohlfeld 1995, 2006): 1) necessary loans, used to designate new concepts and things that have no names in the recipient language, e.g., 'pendrive', 'szeryf' taken from English 'pen-drive', 'sheriff'. This group includes also exotics and internationalisms; 2) unnecessary loans, borrowed for some other reason, such as linguistic fashion, e.g., 'sorry', 'bukować' (from 'to book'), 'shopping'. Such words have native counterparts.

As was noted at the beginning of the paper, the number of English borrowings existing in present-day Polish (spoken in Poland) approximates 3,000 lexical items. However, this figure alone does not give us complete information about the influence of English upon Polish as it does not indicate the frequency of English borrowings in Polish. There have been some preliminary analyses concerned with the frequency of English borrowings in Polish. For example, Mańczak-Wohlfeld (2006: 72-81) has analyzed Polish word-frequency dictionaries (Kurcz *et al.* 1990, Imiołczyk 1987, both cited in Mańczak-Wohlfeld 2006: 72-73). The study has shown that English borrowings in Polish are relatively infrequent; e.g., the dictionary by Kurcz *et al.* lists 10,355 most common lexemes. Surprisingly enough, the inventory contains as few as 59 words of English origin.¹⁴ In addition, Mańczak-Wohlfeld has analyzed the knowledge of some of the assimilated English loanwords among 25 first-year students of the English studies at Teacher Training College in Rzeszów and 25 in Kraków. The study has revealed that the meanings of many of the assimilated English lexical borrowings are not commonly known among the respondents; this also points out to the fact that the English loanwords are not in fact used frequently in everyday language.

A different picture appears in the case of the frequency of the use of English borrowings in the language of the Poles living abroad (e.g., the language of young Poles who have emigrated to Great Britain after the entrance of Poland into the European Union), as this problem has attracted much less attention from linguists. It would seem, therefore, that there is still a need to study the frequency of the use of English borrowings both 1) in contemporary Polish spoken in Poland and 2) in Polish spoken by the Poles living

¹³ The word 'weekend' is adapted morphologically, as it inflects and can serve as a base for new derivatives (e.g., 'wyjazd weekendowy' ('weekend trip')), but is not adapted at the level of spelling. Occasionally, one can find such forms as 'tykent' or 'ikend' but they seem to function more like linguistic jokes.

¹⁴ However, both aforementioned frequency dictionaries were based on the material collected in the 1960s and 1970s, which is the main weakness of the study.

abroad. Thus the question asked in the title, "Is Polish really being flooded with English borrowings?", remains open.

It would seem that the most objective method of studying borrowings in any language is the use of the corpus, as it enables a linguist to make hypotheses based on solid evidence: it is then not only possible to state the existence of a given feature, but also to provide the evidence that would not be available without a corpus. Before the present corpus will be described and analyzed, two other corpora (from the previous studies carried out by the author) will be briefly presented. It will then be possible to compare the present findings with those obtained before.

4. THE INFLUENCE OF ENGLISH ON SPOKEN AND WRITTEN CONTEMPORARY POLISH USED IN POLAND

To estimate the influence of English on Polish used in Poland, two corpora have been collected, one of the spoken language (Zabawa 2006, 2009a) and the other of written Polish (Zabawa forthcoming). The results are briefly described below.

The corpus of spoken Polish described here consists of spontaneous conversations recorded in informal situations, such as e.g., during a birthday party, various meetings, etc. The corpus comprises 20 recordings (60,564 running words in total), recorded in 2002 and 2003. 48 speakers participated in the conversations, out of whom 39 have been taken into account (the remaining 9 informants were accidental speakers, e.g., people asking for something, who uttered only a few words altogether). The corpus is divided into two subcorpora: the first one, comprising conversations on various topics, mostly connected with everyday activities, such as working, talking about one's family and friends, cooking, doing shopping, etc., and the second one, consisting of conversations about computers, the Internet and modern technology in general.

In the corpus of spoken Polish in question, 225 tokens of English borrowings have been found (Zabawa 2006).¹⁵ Table 1 below presents the number of English lexical loans as a percentage of the total number of words of the corpus. This is done separately for general conversations, and for conversations connected with computers.

¹⁵ Both the assimilated and unassimilated borrowings were included in the analysis. Derived items were counted as separate tokens. The etymology of the words found in the corpus was determined on the basis on Mańczak-Wohlfeld's dictionary (1994), the dictionaries of Polish and of foreign terms: Dubisz (2003), Bańko (2003) as well as English monolingual dictionaries: Soanes and Stevenson (2003) and Wehmeier (2000).

Table 1. Number of the loanwords in the spoken corpus as % of the total number of words

Spoken Polish (general)	0.19%
Spoken Polish (computers)	0.80%
Spoken Polish (60,564 words)	0.37%

As shown in Table 1, the loanwords of English origin in informal spoken Polish can actually be said to be quite rare. In the case of spoken general Polish, they constitute less than 0.20% of the entire corpus. As might have been expected, they are more frequent in the conversations about computers, but even there they constitute less than 1% of the corpus (0.80%). On the whole (i.e., including recorded conversations both on computers and those of general character), the lexical elements of English origin constitute 0.37% of the corpus (Zabawa 2006).¹⁶

The corpus of written language (henceforth Corpus of Written Polish 1) consists of the texts taken from the Internet message board *Forumowisko* (www.forumowisko.pl).¹⁷ The texts can be classified as informal or semi-formal. Within the corpus, two subcorpora have been collected: the first one consists of the latest 2,000 words written by 7 randomly chosen users on various topics (14,000 words in total), while the second one comprises randomly chosen posts taken from the subforum on computers (5,000 words in total). Thus, the former represents general Polish, whereas the latter embraces specialist language connected with one specific semantic field. The entire corpus consists of 19,000 words (Zabawa forthcoming).

The number of English lexical borrowings found here was clearly larger (in terms of percentages) than in the case of the corpus of spoken language. In the first subcorpus here (i.e. the latest 2,000 words written by 7 randomly chosen users on various topics; 14,000 words in total), 114 English loanwords (tokens) were found in the corpus. In the case of the second subcorpus (i.e., randomly chosen posts taken from the subforum on computers; 5,000 words in total), 107 English lexical borrowings (tokens) were found in the corpus (Zabawa, forthcoming). Table 2 shows the number of English borrowings as a percentage of the entire corpus.

¹⁶ A similar result was obtained by Otwinowska-Kasztelanica (2000). In general, her study focuses on semantic and syntactic influence of English upon Polish, but she has counted the frequency of English lexical borrowings as well. In her corpus, they constitute 0.41% of the running words.

¹⁷ It seems that new linguistic phenomena appear frequently first on the Internet, and only then are they transferred into the language of the press and television.

Table 2. Number of the loanwords in Corpus of Written Polish 1 as % of the total number of words

Internet message board (general)	1.03%
Internet message board (subforum on computers and the Internet)	2.18%
Internet message boards (19,000 words)	1.33%

All the borrowings found in the discussed corpus can be classified into two different groups: 1) full loan words, e.g., 'billboard', 'hacker', 'firewall', 'trial', 'update', 'paintball', 'T-shirt', and 2) abbreviations or acronyms typical of Internet communication, e.g., 'btw' ('by the way'), 'IMO' ('in my opinion'), 'lol' ('laughing out loud') (Zabawa forthcoming).

6. THE INFLUENCE OF ENGLISH ON WRITTEN CONTEMPORARY POLISH USED IN GREAT BRITAIN

5.1. The description of the corpus (Corpus of Written Polish 2)

The main aim of the article, as was mentioned in Section 1, is to describe English loans used by the Poles living in Great Britain, with special emphasis on their frequency. The corpus on which the present study is based consists of texts taken from the Internet message boards intended for the aforementioned group of people:

- <http://www.mojawyspa.co.uk/forum>: 54.152 registered users, 17.508 topics, 272.828 posts (as of November 2009);
- <http://www.gbritain.net/forum/>: 3.745 registered users, 2.639 topics, 23.466 posts (as of November 2009).¹⁸

The corpus consists of randomly chosen posts (20,034 words in total) on various topics, mostly connected with everyday life in Great Britain, such as looking for a flat, renting a flat, starting a one-man business, looking for a Polish dentist in London, looking for a Polish bakery, looking for friends, comparing secondary schools in London, transferring money to Poland, applying for a bank loan, doing shopping (with special emphasis on buying clothes), cooking dinners, buying and installing a satellite antenna, discussing the situation of Poland and Great Britain after the entrance of the former into the European Union, discussing the best places to live in London, discussing music (with special emphasis on the Depeche Mode band), etc.

¹⁸ Both the forums are quite large, in terms of the number of registered users and the total number of topics and posts.

The texts written by 183 users have been taken into account (110 words per author on average). Naturally, the number is only an approximation, as it cannot be excluded that some users may take part in both forums using different nicknames. The texts are mostly semi-formal, but some can also be described as relatively formal. It should also be added that the texts written by Poles living in Poland and only intending to emigrate to Great Britain have been excluded from the corpus.¹⁹ In addition, all the quotations from advertisements, leaflets, newspaper articles (in either Polish or English) were excluded from the study as well.

5.2. Description of the borrowings found in the corpus

In the corpus, 346 tokens of English lexical loans have been found.²⁰ It should be noted here that all the English proper names, such as names of companies, products, names of railway and tube stations, names of streets, titles of newspapers, movies, books, etc. have not been treated as lexical borrowings and have been excluded from the present analysis. It must also be added that the corpus contains some examples (53 tokens in total) of compound formations borrowed from English (e.g., ‘secondary school’, ‘tax return’, ‘dental access centre’).²¹ They are counted and described separately. The results are presented in percentage terms in Table 3 below.

Table 3. Number of the loanwords in the Corpus of Written Polish 2 as % of the total number of words

Internet message boards for the Poles living in Great Britain (excluding (code-switching) compounds)	1.73%
Internet message boards for the Poles living in Great Britain (including (code-switching) compounds and fixed expressions)	1.99%

¹⁹ Whether a given author still lives in Poland was determined on the basis of the analysis of his or her posts.

²⁰ The loan words in the corpus include derivatives, e.g., ‘komputerowy’ (‘computer (Adj)’), ‘komputerowo’ (‘computer-like (Adv)’), ‘komputerowiec’ (‘a person who likes computers and uses them a lot’).

²¹ In fact, they appear to be instances of code-switching (i.e., “quotes”) rather than borrowings. The distinction between unassimilated borrowings and instances of code-switching appears to be vague, however. The linguists have proposed a number of criteria, such as the degree of assimilation, the number of occurrences of a given form, etc. Such criteria, however, are relative rather than absolute (for details, see e.g., MacSwan 1997: 74-75). In the present analysis, the distinction is made between single word borrowings and borrowed formatives made of more than one lexical root.

All the borrowings in the corpus considered in this study can be classified into two different groups: 1) full loan words, e.g., ‘biznes’ (‘business’), ‘link’, ‘e-mail’, ‘sorry/sory/sorki’ (‘sorry’), ‘post’, ‘benefit’, ‘council’, 2) abbreviations or acronyms, e.g., ‘LOL’ (‘laughing out loud’), ‘BTW’ (‘by the way’), ‘VAT’ (‘value added tax’), ‘UK’ (‘United Kingdom’), ‘NIN’ (‘National Insurance Number’),²² ‘chb’ (‘child benefit’), ‘p/w’ (‘per week’). Some of them are characteristic of the people living in an English-speaking country only and are not attested in Poland, e.g., ‘benefit’, ‘council’, ‘cleaner’, ‘payslip’, ‘outfit’, ‘NIN’, ‘chb’, whereas others are found in the language of monolingual Poles in Poland as well, e.g., ‘free’, ‘bukować’ (‘to book’), ‘interview’, ‘post’, ‘hostel’, ‘LOL’, ‘BTW’.

The loans from both groups (i.e. full words and abbreviations/acronyms) have been divided into two subgroups: *old* borrowings and *new* borrowings. The criterion of the distinction was purely technical: the existence (or non-existence) of a given borrowing as an entry in the dictionary of foreign words in Polish (Bańko 2003). The words that were included in the aforementioned dictionary were labelled as *old* (e.g., ‘biznes’, ‘link’, ‘e-mail’),²³ whereas those that were not – as *new* (‘sorry/sory/sorki’, ‘post’, ‘benefit’, ‘council’).²⁴ The distinction was carried out separately for the loans from the first and from the second group. The number of tokens of both *old* and *new* borrowings (as well as percentages of the total number of words of the corpus) has been given in Table 4.

Table 4. Number of the *old* and *new* loanwords as well as % of the total number of words of the Corpus of Written Polish 2

	lexical borrowings: full words		acronyms and abbreviations	
	<i>old</i>	<i>new</i>	<i>old</i>	<i>new</i>
tokens	118	100	20	108
% of the total number of words	0.59	0.50	0.10	0.53
total	346 tokens, i.e., 1.73% of the total number of words (1.99% including (code-switching) compounds and fixed expressions)			

As illustrated in Table 4, there is almost an even distribution and frequency of the use of the old and new English loans belonging to the group of full words. A different picture appears, however, when we compare the loans belonging to the group of acronyms and abbreviations. Most of them

²² They also appeared in the corpus in small letters, e.g., ‘lol’, ‘btw’, ‘nin’, etc.
²³ Most of them are fully or partly assimilated in Polish.
²⁴ Many of the *new* loans (but by no means all) can be classified as unassimilated.

belong to the group of new borrowings; in fact, many of them are culturally restricted to Great Britain, as shown in Section 5.3. below, and thus are quite unlikely to appear in the Polish language used in Poland.

5.3. Examples of the borrowings found in the corpus

Some examples of the borrowings of English origin found in the corpus are presented below:²⁵

- full words: 1) *old*: 'sport', 'fan', 'biznes' ('business'), 'komputer' ('computer'), 'link', 'weekend', 'bukować' ('to book'), 'lunch', 'budżet' ('budget'), 'bar', 'pub', 'partner', 'test', 'e-mail', 'hostel', 'college', 'image', 'hobby', 'lunch', 'market', 'bar', 'net'; 2) *new*: 'posh', 'outfit', 'take-away', 'statement', 'cleaner', 'bedroom', 'landlord', 'interview', 'tax', 'benefit', 'free', 'payslip', 'housing', 'limited', 'council', 'subcontractor', 'post';
- acronyms and abbreviations: 1) *old*: 'ok', 'VAT'; (2) *new*: 'btw' ('by the way'), 'NIN' ('National Insurance Number'), 'UK' ('United Kingdom'), 'HO' ('Home Office'), 'chb' ('child benefit'), 'p/w' ('per week'), 'p/m' ('per month'), 'EU' ('European Union').

Apart from the two groups listed above, the corpus contains some examples of 'code-switching' compound nouns, e.g., 'tax return', 'dental access centre', '1 bedroom flat', 'job centre', 'bank statement', 'nursery school', 'dental surgery', 'council tax', 'housing advisor', 'charity shop', 'secondary school', 'make appointment',²⁶ 'creative writing', 'tube station'.

Many of the borrowings, particularly from the *new* group, appeared only once in the corpus; this could suggest that such forms are still far from assimilated and their use may be to some extent accidental and probably depends on the idiolect of a given speaker. Some of them, however, appeared with a relatively high frequency; such borrowings are listed below, with the number of occurrences in square brackets:

- lexical borrowings-full words: *old*: 'college' [9], 'singiel/singel/single' [9], 'fan' [7], 'biznes/biznesowy' ('business (N/Adj)') [7], 'test' [6], 'weekend' [5], 'link' [5], 'pub' [5]; *new*: 'council' [15], 'benefit' [13], 'self-employed' [13], 'invoice' [9];
- acronyms and abbreviations: *old*: 'VAT' [11], 'ok' [9]; *new*: 'UK' [45], 'NHS' ('National Health Service') [10].

²⁵ Some of the borrowings varied as to their spelling, e.g., UK/uk/Uk, VAT/vat, ok/OK/Ok, sorry/sory, singiel/singel, e-mail/email.

²⁶ Some of the forms contain grammatical errors: 'make appointment' (instead of the correct 'make an appointment').

Apart from full loan words, acronyms or abbreviations, the corpus contains also some examples (much less frequent) of other types of English loans (cf. the typology given in Section 3), such as semantic borrowings, calques, spelling and punctuation borrowings. However, they clearly fall outside the scope of the present paper and will not be discussed here.

6. COMPARISON OF THE THREE CORPORA

As illustrated in Tables 3 and 4, the percentage of English lexical items found in the corpus of written Polish based on Internet message boards intended for the Poles living in Great Britain (Corpus of Written Polish 2) is higher than in the case of the Corpus of Written Polish 1 based on Internet general message boards, i.e., not aimed at any specific audience, as well as than in the case of the corpus of spoken Polish. The results for all the three corpora are compared in Table 5.

Table 5. Number of the loanwords as % of the total number of words

Spoken spontaneous Polish	0.37%
Corpus of Written Polish 1: Internet message boards (general)	1.33%
Corpus of Written Polish 2: Internet message boards (for Poles living in Great Britain)	1.73% (1.99%)

Table 5 shows that there are clear differences in the frequency of English borrowings in the three corpora described in the article. Interestingly but not surprisingly, English loans are used most frequently in the Polish spoken by Poles living abroad, i.e., in the case here, in Great Britain. Still, they can be said to be relatively infrequent (1.73%, or 1.99% if instances of code-switching are included). As for written Polish used in Poland, it contains 1.33% of the lexical borrowings of English origin. They are much less frequent in spoken informal Polish (0.37%).²⁷ It would thus seem that the usage of many of the borrowings is restricted to *Internet Polish*.

²⁷ A similar observation has been made by Otwinowska-Kasztelanica (2000: 152), who reports that spoken Polish is quite conservative in terms of the use of English loanwords.

7. CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, it can be stated that the frequency of the use of English borrowings in the Polish language is generally relatively low.²⁸ Interestingly enough, the loans of English origin are much more frequent in informal written Polish (used both in Poland and abroad) than in spoken colloquial Polish. One possible explanation might be connected with the fact that spoken language is generally characterized by the frequent repetition of lexical items and of similar syntactic constructions. At the same time, it is claimed to have a lower concentration of new information than writing. As a result, it is reasonable to expect that the number of borrowings (in terms of a percentage of the entire text) will be smaller in the case of spoken texts, as the same sentences are often repeated during a conversation. This, in turn, increases the number of running words in the corpus of spoken Polish, with the number of borrowings usually staying at the same level. The written mode of expression, by contrast, is usually characterized by “a greater density of ideas” (DeVito, quoted in Akinnaso 1982: 101). As a consequence, such a variety will not normally contain repetitions and other redundant features, thus diminishing the total number of words and – at the same time – making the percentages of English loanwords higher than in the case of spoken language.

Apart from the mode of expression (written or spoken), the topic of the conversation plays a very important role in connection with the usage of English borrowings as well. Unsurprisingly, the number of English lexical elements in Polish is much higher in the texts (be it written or spoken) on computers, the Internet, and modern technology in general. What is more, many of the borrowings in the semantic area of computers are highly specialized; in fact, they often belong to the computer register and are not very likely to be understood by the people not dealing with computers.

A different picture appears in the case of the borrowings used by the Poles living in Great Britain. The frequency of their use is, as might be expected, higher than in the case of the Polish used in Poland (be it written or spoken). Many of the borrowings, however, can be classified as accidental, as they appeared only once in the entire corpus.²⁹ Most of them, contrary to those used in Poland, can be classified as unnecessary, since they have perfect native Polish counterparts. They are probably used either because of a desire to create a link with the target culture and the British way of life or the inability to find an appropriate Polish counterpart (L1 attrition).³⁰

²⁸ This corroborates Mańczak-Wohlfeld’s (2006) observation about the low frequency of English loanwords in Polish made on the basis of frequency dictionaries (cf. Section 3).

²⁹ By contrast, few borrowings appeared more than five times.

³⁰ See also Mańczak-Wohlfeld (1995: 78–82) for some interesting observations about the Polish used by the Poles living in the United States.

However, it should be noted that the use of some of them may be seen as justified from the point of view of linguistic economy: English lexical items, particularly (recursive) compounds, tend to be shorter than their Polish equivalents (cf. 'charity shop' vs. 'sklep z rzeczami używanymi, prowadzony zazwyczaj przez organizację charytatywną').

Finally, the paper can be concluded with the statement that Poles use English borrowings in speech and writing, but by no means are the borrowings overused. The present study, conducted on the basis of currently available empirical material, corroborates the observation made by Mańczak-Wohlfeld (2006) on the basis of material collected in the 1960s and 1970s: contemporary Polish, spoken both in Poland and abroad, does not seem to be flooded with English borrowings.

SOURCES

- Bańko, M. (ed.). (2003). *Wielki słownik wyrazów obcych PWN*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Dubisz, S. (ed.). (2003). *Uniwersalny słownik języka polskiego*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Soanes, C., Stevenson, A. (eds.). (2003). *Oxford dictionary of English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wehmeier, S. (ed.). (2000). *Oxford advanced learner's dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

REFERENCES

- Akinnaso, F.N. (1982). On the differences between spoken and written language. *Language and Speech* 25(2): 97-125.
- Arabski, J. (2004). Compliment responses in a cross-cultural perspective. In J. Arabski (ed.). *Pragmatics and language learning*. Kraków: Universitas. 11-19.
- Błasiak, M. (2008). Ponglish, czyli nowe zjawisko językowo-kulturowe w Wielkiej Brytanii. *Język Polski* LXXXVIII 2: 156-162.
- Bussman, H. (1998). *Routledge dictionary of language and linguistics*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Chalker, S., Weiner, E. (1994). *Oxford dictionary of English grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Crystal, D. (2008). *A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Doroszewski, W. (1938). *Język polski w Stanach Zjednoczonych A.P.* Warszawa: TNW.
- Dubisz, S. (2001). Język polski poza granicami kraju. In S. Gajda (ed.). *Najnowsze dzieje języków słowiańskich. Język polski*. Opole: Uniwersytet Opolski. 492-514.

- Grabowski, Y. (1988). Kontakty językowe. Uwagi na temat asymilacji wpływów angielskich w językach słowiańskich na terenie Ameryki Północnej. In M. Basaj et al. (ed.). *Wokół języka. Rozprawy i studia poświęcone pamięci profesora Mieczysława Szymczaka*. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich. 161-165.
- Haugen, E. (1950). The analysis of linguistic borrowing. *Language* 26: 210-231.
- Kreja, B. (1993). O formancie *-gate* 'afera, skandal'. *Język Polski* LXXIII 1-2: 63-68.
- Lewiński, P. (2000). O osobliwościach języka chicagowskiego. In J. Mazur (ed.). *Słownictwo współczesnej polszczyzny w okresie przemian*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej. 191-197.
- MacSwan, J. (1997). *A Minimalist approach to intrasentential code switching: Spanish-Nahuatl bilingualism in central Mexico*. PhD dissertation. Los Angeles: University of California. Available online at: <http://www.public.asu.edu/~macswan/diss.html> (access: December 2010).
- Mańczak-Wohlfeld, E. (1992). *Analiza dekompozycyjna zapożyczeń angielskich w języku polskim*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
- Mańczak-Wohlfeld, E. (1993). Uwagi o wpływie języka angielskiego na polszczyznę końca XX w. *Język Polski* LXXIII(4-5): 279-281.
- Mańczak-Wohlfeld, E. (1994). *Angielskie elementy leksykalne w języku polskim*. Kraków: Universitas.
- Mańczak-Wohlfeld, E. (1995). *Tendencje rozwojowe współczesnych zapożyczeń angielskich w języku polskim*. Kraków: Universitas.
- Mańczak-Wohlfeld, E. (2006). *Angielsko-polskie kontakty językowe*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
- Mańczak-Wohlfeld, E. (ed.). (2010). *Słownik zapożyczeń angielskich w polszczyźnie*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Markowski, A. (2000). Jawne i ukryte nowsze zapożyczenia leksykalne w mediach. In J. Bralczyk, K. Mosiołek-Kłosińska (eds.). *Język w mediach masowych*. Warszawa: Oświata. 96-111.
- Otwinowska-Kasztelanic, A. (2000). *A study of the lexico-semantic and grammatical influence of English on the Polish of the younger generation of Poles (19-35 years of age)*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Akademickie Dialog.
- Weinreich, U. (1974). *Languages in contact*. The Hague and Paris: Mouton.
- Witalisz, A. (2007). *Anglosemantyzyzm w języku polskim – ze słownikiem*. Kraków: Tertium.
- Zabawa, M. (2004a). Formy z cząstką *e-* we współczesnym języku polskim. *Poradnik Językowy* 5: 55-60.
- Zabawa, M. (2004b). Nowe zapożyczenia semantyczne w polszczyźnie. *Poradnik Językowy* 9: 59-68.
- Zabawa, M. (2005). Po przecinku czy po kropce? *Poradnik Językowy* 8: 70-72.
- Zabawa, M. (2006). *English Lexical and Semantic Loans in Informal Spoken Polish*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Silesia.
- Zabawa, M. (2008). Jeszcze o nowych zapożyczeniach semantycznych w polszczyźnie. *Poradnik Językowy* 9: 28-41.

- Zabawa, M. (2009a). A corpus of spoken language and its usefulness in the research on language contact. In: J. Levicka, R. Garabik (eds.). *NLP, Corpus Linguistics, Corpus Based Grammar Research*. Bratislava: Slovak Academy of Sciences. 377-388.
- Zabawa, M. (2009b). My blogasek bierze udział w konQursie – czy polskie blogi internetowe są pisane po polsku? In M. Filiciak, G. Ptaszek (eds.). *Komunikowanie (się) w mediach elektronicznych – język, edukacja, semiotyka*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Akademickie i Profesjonalne. 60-78.
- Zabawa, M. (2009c). 'Begergate', 'Konkubina gate', 'Pierścień-gate': o poważnym i mniej poważnym użyciu części -gate w polskim Internecie. *Poradnik Językowy* 10: 32-42.
- Zabawa, M. (forthcoming). The influence of English on the Polish language of Internet message boards: investigating the role of individual differences and the context. *Linguistica Silesiana* 31.

Part 2

LANGUAGE VARIATION

Jerzy Freundlich

Andrzej Frycz Modrzewski Krakow University

AMERICANIZATION OF BRITISH ENGLISH: ASPECTS OF LINGUISTIC CHANGE IN THE SPEECH OF EDUCATED BRITISH SPEAKERS

STRESZCZENIE

Celem przedstawionej pracy jest wstępna analiza wybranych, współcześnie zachodzących zmian w języku angielskim używanym przez wykształconych rodzimych brytyjskich użytkowników języka, czyli w ogólnej (standardowej) brytyjskiej odmianie języka angielskiego. Omawiane zmiany dotyczą form językowych, których użycie jest rozpowszechnione nie tylko w potocznej, lecz również w standardowej amerykańskiej odmianie języka angielskiego, co wskazuje na to, że zmiany te nastąpiły pod wpływem amerykańskim. Wpływ amerykański na słownictwo brytyjskiej odmiany języka angielskiego jest zjawiskiem znanym i szeroko opisanym w literaturze, natomiast omawiane tu zmiany wyróżniają się tym, że dotyczą form gramatycznych, a mianowicie nietypowej składni pytań pośrednich, użycia 'like' w funkcji spójnika zdaniowego, 'of' w przyimkach przestrzennych (np. 'inside of') oraz 'likely' jako przysłówka. Korpus językowy stanowi zbiór przykładów wziętych z języka prezenterów i korespondentów radia BBC. Według autora, głównymi czynnikami omawianego zjawiska są szybki rozwój komunikacji, głównie elektronicznej, oraz prestiż odmiany amerykańskiej języka angielskiego.

1. INTRODUCTION

The main aim of this paper is to reflect on how linguistic change continues to alter contemporary English, especially the model that British-born, middle aged speakers such as the author were brought up on. It is, of course, a tru-

ism that people tend to use linguistic forms that were prevalent when they reached adulthood, and those of us for whom that stage in our lives is fast becoming a dim and distant memory probably feel the effects of linguistic change more keenly than most, giving rise to a variety of subjective responses. We may, in our darker moments, despair that the language we know and love is being ruthlessly displaced by a tacky concoction of heterodox grammar and fleetingly fashionable lexis, and engage in a futile, last-ditch attempt to save the beloved creature from extinction. In the cold light of reason, however, this Canutish reaction gives way to an acknowledgment that change is a defining feature of a living language and that analyzing linguistic change is a far more useful exercise than trying to resist it.

The impetus for this short paper comes from the author's observation of certain recent grammatical changes in spoken British English which make use of forms already in widespread use in the U.S.¹ Although the influence of American English on its British counterpart is considerable and well attested in the area of lexis, the phonology and grammar of the latter have been considerably more impervious to the influence of the former (Kövecses 2000: 88, Trudgill 2002: 148). Citing the distinction between *diffusion* and *independent development*, Trudgill (2002) advises the exercise of caution in ascribing grammatical change in British usage to American influence. It is certainly true that all varieties of English are complex and constantly evolving organisms and care should be taken in attributing influence and causal links involved in linguistic change. Notwithstanding Trudgill's reservations, however, it would not be unreasonable to make at least a *prima facie* case for American influence where the change in question corresponds to already established colloquial American usage.

The American influence on British English is pervasive (Kövecses 2000: 88) and two recent developments may be cited as fairly clear-cut examples of diffusion from the former to the latter. One is the use by a small but growing number of British speakers who pronounce the word 'nuclear' as 'nucular'. Although this pronunciation is "non-standard" in the sense of being generally stigmatized by educated speakers in the U.S., there is a history of its being used by certain North American communities (Newman 1988: 274). In the author's experience it was unheard of in the U.K. until quite recently and is almost certainly the result of this pronunciation being that favored by the former U.S. President George W. Bush and the subsequent media exposure. The other example is the rapidly growing adoption in British informal speech of a long-established feature of American English, that of using 'good' in response to the question 'How are you?' instead of the traditional British 'well' or 'fine'. These examples of the strength of U.S. influence on British speech

¹ It should be stressed that the findings presented are preliminary and based on an, as yet, limited corpus of data.

may be adduced to support the case for assuming diffusion in the changes examined in this paper.

An important aspect of this thesis is that it is concerned with changes appearing in the speech of educated British speakers, in other words, of spoken Standard British English. Although there is some debate over what Standard English is (cf. Bex and Watts 1999), the present work will largely follow Trudgill's characterization that it is a "social dialect which is distinguished from other dialects in the language by its *grammatical forms*" (Trudgill 1999: 118), and which is spoken by those considered to be the best educated in society. Despite the fact that the term *Standard English* frequently refers to the written language, Standard English is as much a spoken as a written form, and Trudgill is, in my view, undoubtedly correct when he disagrees with the notion that "nobody speaks Standard English" (Trudgill 1999: 120).

The aim of this paper is to describe a number of grammatical forms in widespread use in the U.S., but not in British English, which in recent years have begun to be increasingly used by educated British speakers.

2. CORPUS

The language under investigation is British English as used by educated native speakers. Why educated? In a study of this kind certain benchmarks and reference points must be assumed. The English of speakers educated to tertiary level is less prone to the influence of regional dialects and non-standard grammar, which is of considerable significance given that the present work focuses on changes in grammatical usage which constitute deviations from what has generally been held to be the standard. Since a written corpus would not necessarily give any indication of the educational background or the regional (or even national) provenance of the speaker, the author has collected his own examples to ensure that they were uttered by educated British native speakers, the informants being voices on the radio, mainly presenters and correspondents from the BBC World Service, heard in 2009-2010. Most are RP speakers, although this is incidental and was not a factor in their selection. Wherever possible, the speaker is identified by name.²

3. CHANGES IN GRAMMATICAL USAGE OBSERVED IN BRITISH SPEAKERS

3.1. Word order in indirect questions

According to Butters (1976: 57), the non-standard variety of indirect question "merely uses the direct-question order in the slot where standard Eng-

² As most of the examples were written down as heard on radio in real time, it was not always possible to identify the speaker.

lish uses *if, whether* or a question word, followed by the declarative order," as shown in (1a) below compared with the standard form shown in (1b):

- (1) a. I'd like to know *why did you choose* to be an engineer.
- b. I'd like to know *why you chose* to be an engineer.

In an earlier paper, Butters made two points concerning these forms:

(1) characteristic use of these forms is not limited to American dialects, but is found in British dialects (especially Anglo-Irish) as well – thus suggesting British historical origins for the forms; and (2) the “non-standard” forms are actually in widespread use, at least in certain ways, among even standard American speakers, and appear to be part of a variable rule for speakers of many, and perhaps all, dialects of English. (Butters 1974: 230)

Butters' second point is certainly true in respect of American speakers and is corroborated by Wolfram and Schilling-Estes (2006), who confirm that the use of inverted word order in indirect questions is well established in the U.S. These authors include it among structures “which were once thought to be confined to vernacular varieties but have been shown to be quite common in informal *standard* varieties” (Wolfram and Schilling-Estes 2006: 384, *italics mine*). However, Butters' first point concerning British dialects as well as his suggestion in the second point that the non-standard forms “appear to be part of a variable rule for speakers of many, and perhaps all, dialects of English” (Butters 1974: 230) require comment.

The form with inversion is well documented as a feature of Irish English (e.g., Filppula 1999: 167). One might speculate that the widespread use of this form among U.S. speakers may be the result of large-scale Irish immigration to the U.S. Its use in non-standard British regional varieties (Tyne-side and Northumbrian) has also been described (Beal 1993: 204). It should be remembered that this paper is concerned with Standard British English, characterized as the social dialect used by educated speakers. There is little data to indicate any consistent or widespread use of this form in the speech of educated British speakers until quite recently; however, the evidence now suggests a growing trend towards use of the “non-standard” form, as the following examples from British presenters on the BBC World service testify:

- (2) Many wonder *where will it stop*. (Owen Bennett-Jones)
- (3) I asked him *how much notice should we take*. (Leslie Curwen)
- (4) I wonder *is there a difference between them*. (Julian Worricker)

3.2. Conjunctive 'like'

Prescriptive grammarians on both sides of the Atlantic have condemned the use of 'like' as a subordinating conjunction (Gilman 1994: 600-601), distinguishing between prepositional and conjunctive statements of similarity. The prescriptive view is that only the former uses 'like', as illustrated in (5), while the latter requires 'as' or 'as if/though', as shown respectively in (6) and (7); 'as' is also prescribed to introduce prepositional phrases, as demonstrated in (8) below:³

- (5) You look like your sister.
- (6) I joined the Labor Party, as previous generations of my family had. ('as', not 'like')
- (7) It looks as if he's going to be late. ('as if', not 'like')
- (8) You'll have to give a presentation, as in the first semester. ('as', not 'like')

Even though it has been shown that the prescriptive prohibition on conjunctive 'like' assumed significance only in the 19th century and is not based on sound historical principles (Gilman 1994: 600-602), it was heavily stigmatized throughout the 20th century in British prescriptive circles, being variously dismissed as "illiterate", "vulgar", "sloppy", "proletarian" or acceptable only in "informal or American" usage (Burchfield 1998: 458). By the end of that century, however, the situation had changed markedly:

It would appear that in many kinds of written and spoken English *like* as a conjunction is struggling towards acceptable *standard* or neutral ground. It is not there yet. But the distributional patterns suggest that the long-standing resistance to this omnipresent little word is beginning to crumble. (Burchfield 1998: 459; emphasis mine)

Examples such as the following (all from speakers of British Standard English) are now equally likely to be heard on either side of the Atlantic:

- (9) *Like I said*, you shouldn't assume people always understand you. (cf. *As I said ...*)
- (10) They celebrated *like they'd won the trophy*. (cf. *... as if they'd won ...*)
- (11) They might get hit *like on 9/11*. (cf. *... as on 9/11*)

Since the sources quoted above make it clear that conjunctive 'like' has a long history in British English, its use *per se* in that variety could obviously

³ A detailed historical account of the development of the prescriptive position together with a substantial list of historical examples, many of which contradict the prescriptive view, can be found in Gilman (1994: 600-603).

not be the result of American influence; however, one could plausibly argue that the pressure towards the dismantling of the prohibition on its use among educated speakers has spread from the U.S. to the U.K.⁴

Concerning one specific conjunctive use of 'like', however, we need not be quite so coy in attributing American influence to British usage: namely, that of functioning as a complementizer (instead of 'that') after the verb 'feel'. In British English the combination 'feel like' has traditionally been used in two ways: one is in similes followed by a noun, e.g., 'I felt like a fool'; the other is to indicate that we want to do or have something, followed by either a noun or a gerund, e.g., 'I feel like a pizza'; 'I feel like going for a walk'. But British speakers are now using 'feel like' in an entirely different way: to mean 'feel that', in the sense of holding an opinion or having a conviction about something. 'Like' introduces what is in effect a 'that'-clause.⁵

(12) *I feel like* we're in the golden age of the science. (U.S. speaker)

(13) *I feel like* they ought to stop. (British speaker)

(14) *I feel like* the government has overstepped the mark. (British speaker)

A search of a diachronic corpus of American English spanning the last 80 years (Davis n.d.) revealed that this use of 'feel like' has been growing in the U.S. since the 1980s, most rapidly since the 1990s.⁶ Unfortunately, there do not appear to be any corpora of British English offering a similarly diachronic presentation of the data. The present author's perception is that this use of 'feel like' is of very recent provenance in the U.K.⁷ but appears to be taking hold very rapidly in British speech. Since the TIME Magazine corpus shows no instances earlier than 1950 and suggests more widespread use only from the 1990s, this would represent a particularly noteworthy example of a grammatical structure being diffused from the U.S. to the U.K. extremely soon (by historical standards) after becoming established in its country of origin.

⁴ The fact that throughout the 20th century British prescriptive grammars generally described conjunctive 'like' as "American" usage would appear to support this view.

⁵ This gives a surface string structurally identical to 'feel as if/though', e.g., 'I felt like (as though/that) I'd been mugged'. The context should determine which use applies; however, some examples could conceivably be taken either way, e.g., 'I don't feel like (as though/that) I committed a crime at all'.

⁶ No occurrences have been found before the 1950s, then: 1950s – 2 examples; 1960s – 0; 1970s – 1; 1980s – 6; 1990s – 18; 2000–2006 – 41. Interestingly, a search for the string 'feel that' in the same corpus over the last three decades revealed an inverse relationship with occurrences of the complementizer 'like', the figures being: 1980s – 220; 1990s – 130; 2000–2006 – 109 (Davis: n.d.).

⁷ The author has been aware of its use among British speakers only from about 2004–2005.

3.3. Complex spatial prepositions

The complex spatial preposition 'in front of', which is used identically on both sides of the Atlantic, shares its structure (preposition + noun + 'of') with other spatial prepositions whose distribution has, until recently, not been so evenly distributed. Almost entirely absent from standard British usage have been 'in back of', 'alongside of', 'inside of' and 'outside of', although these have all been in fairly widespread use in the United States.⁸ Standard British English omits 'of' in the latter three and exclusively uses 'behind' for 'in back of'. It should be stressed that the British forms are also standard in the US. However, in recent years the author has detected a fairly dramatic increase in the use of 'inside of' and 'outside of' among British speakers.

- (15) the refugees *inside of* the compound (British speaker)
- (16) *outside of* London (Rebecca Kesby)
- (17) children raised *outside of* Mainland China (Stephen Sackur)

The corpus gathered by the author does not have any instances of 'in back of' used by a British speaker; however, there is one instance of 'alongside of', spoken by a British doctor interviewed on the BBC World Service.

3.4. Adverbial use of 'likely'

The *Shorter Oxford English Dictionary* classifies 'likely' as both an adjective and adverb, but gives the adverb an earlier provenance (Onions 1970: 1143). The adverbial meaning which concerns us here is the second listed, the modal meaning of 'probably', together with the annotation that it is now chiefly used with the qualifiers 'most' and 'very', e.g., 'Profits will most likely rise next year', implying that the use of 'likely' meaning 'probably' without these qualifiers is not standard in British English, having become obsolete.

The situation in American English is somewhat different:

To sum up, the use of *likely* as an adverb without a qualifier such as *more*, *most*, *very*, or *quite* is well established in standard general use in North America. It is an old use, dating back to the 14th century. The strictures on it seem to have developed because it dropped out of mainstream literary use in England during the 19th century. (Gilman 1994: 604)

However, there is good evidence that the use of 'likely' as an adverb without an accompanying qualifier is making a comeback in British English, as these examples from British speakers testify:

⁸ According to Gilman (1994: 552-553, 702-703), American linguists are divided as to when or whether 'inside of' and 'outside of' are acceptable in any other than colloquial usage. However, 'in back of' is considered to be standard American usage (1994: 158-159). Gilman concludes that 'alongside of' is also standard, but possibly becoming obsolete (1994: 78).

- (18) It will *likely* cut the connection.
 (19) It will *likely* be several years before the technology comes to the market.
 (20) The government will *likely* lose the election.

Thus, we would here appear to have an example of a form which, having dropped out of standard British usage, is being reintroduced under the influence of standard American usage.

4. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Two aspects of the changes examined above are noteworthy: firstly, that they affect the *grammar* of British English (as opposed to lexis); and secondly, the speed of change. Trudgill (2002: 148) makes the point that “grammatical change is much slower than lexical change,” and it is certainly true that the former is measured in years, or even dozens of years, while the latter may be evidenced in a mere matter of months. However, the present author has been struck by the speed with which some of the changes examined here seem to be taking place.⁹

We cannot at this stage be categorical about the reasons for these trends, but the following would be likely factors: 1) the effects of accelerating technological change (and America’s role in the vanguard of such development) since the middle of the 20th century in cinema and musical reproduction, satellite communication, advances in aviation enabling quicker and cheaper transatlantic travel, and finally, perhaps most significantly, the Internet and mobile technology; and 2) the strength of American political, economic and cultural influence as “the world’s only superpower”, which, whether consciously or subconsciously, may convince many British speakers that there is a certain cachet in using a more American-sounding form of speech.

An illustration from the author’s experience may serve to demonstrate this last point. The London of the 1950s and 1960s (in which the author grew up) was home to a sizeable first-generation Irish immigrant population, which formed a speech community using Irish varieties of English including such features as non-standard word order in indirect questions, as described in section 3.1. above. Far from being adopted by the native population, such non-standard forms were generally received with mild amusement if not outright ridicule. At that time the Irish immigrant community were generally regarded as poorly educated and of low social status; in consequence, their speech was held to be a low prestige variety and it would have been unthinkable

⁹ This observation is made on the basis of the author’s perceptions and awaits the corroboration of reliable diachronic data.

able for its features, including the non-standard form of indirect question, to be considered a model for emulation. The fact that the very same form is now being embraced by British speakers as a result (the author would argue) of American influence demonstrates how the perceived high prestige of a particular variety (in this case U.S. English) can be an important factor in linguistic change. Some readers may raise an eyebrow at the idea that educated British speakers would perceive U.S. English as a higher prestige variety than their own; there is, indeed, something of a paradox in this, to which Kövecses (2000) has drawn attention:

The British attitude to American English exhibits two contradictory features. One is that the British say, either implicitly or explicitly, that their English is superior to that of the Americans There is, however, a tendency in the relationship between British and American English that undercuts this view. In the twentieth century, American English has had a far greater influence on British English than vice-versa. ... The outcome is an extremely complex sociolinguistic and cultural situation. (Kövecses 2000: 88)

Prestige in sociolinguistics has traditionally been associated with social class, and overt prestige understood as a mechanism for linguistically identifying with a superior social class. I would argue that linguistic prestige can equally be considered a function of power and influence, such as undoubtedly exists in the position of the U.S. *vis-à-vis* Britain. The adoption by British speakers of American linguistic norms may be seen, in this light, as a form of overt prestige.

The present paper has not included other areas of grammar where the author's research is still ongoing, such as noun countability and use of tenses. However, there is growing evidence that in these as well as in other areas of grammar the differences between British and American English may well converge, with the former adopting the usage of the latter, thus supporting historical linguists' and sociolinguists' view that language contact and complex social factors can lead to structural linguistic change and structural diffusion.

REFERENCES

- Beal, J. (1993). The grammar of Tyneside and Northumbrian English. In J. Milroy and L. Milroy (eds.). *Real English: the grammar of English dialects in the British Isles*. London and New York: Longman. 187-213.
- Bex, T., Watts, R.J. (1999). Introduction. In T. Bex and R.J. Watts (eds.). *Standard English: the widening debate*. London: Routledge. 1-12.
- Burchfield, R.W. (1998). *Fowler's modern English usage*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Butters, R. R. (1974). Variability in indirect questions. *American Speech* 49(3/4): 230-234.
- Butters, R. R. (1976). More on indirect questions. *American Speech* 51(1/2): 57-62.
- Davis, M. (n.d.). TIME Magazine Corpus of American English, 1923-2006. [online] <http://corpus.byu.edu/time/>, [29. 03. 2010].
- Filppula, M. (1999). *The grammar of Irish English: language in hibernian style*. London: Routledge.
- Gilman, E.W. (ed.) (1994). *Merriam-Webster's dictionary of English usage*. Springfield, MA: Merriam-Webster.
- Kövecses, Z. (2000). *American English: an introduction*. Ontario: Broadview Press.
- Newman, E. (1988). *I must say: Edwin Newman on English, the news, and other matters*. New York: Grand Central Publishing.
- Onions, C.T. (ed.) (1970). *The shorter Oxford English dictionary on historical principles*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Trudgill, P. (2002). *Sociolinguistic variation and change*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Trudgill, P. (1999). Standard English: what it isn't. In T. Bex and R. J. Watts (eds.). *Standard English: the widening debate*. London: Routledge. 117-128.
- Wolfram, W., Schilling-Estes, N. (2006) *American English: dialects and variation*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Marta Ruda

Jagiellonian University in Krakow

ON THE INTERACTIONS BETWEEN CORE GRAMMAR AND THE PERIPHERY IN INTRALANGUAGE SYNTACTIC VARIATION.

THE CASE OF MISSING OBJECTS IN ENGLISH

STRESZCZENIE

Różnice pomiędzy aspektami systemu językowego, którego własności wynikają z uniwersalnych zasad gramatyki języka naturalnego i aspektami kształtowanymi przez reguły właściwe dla konkretnego języka, na gruncie generatywnej teorii języka zostały ujęte w ramach rozróżnienia na tzw. 'gramatykę rdzeniową' (*Core Grammar*) i 'peryferia językowe' (*Periphery*). Nawiązując do tego podziału, praca omawia zagadnienie różnic wewnątrzjęzykowych na przykładzie właściwości dystrybucyjnych i interpretacyjnych dopełnień domyślnych (tzn. dopełnień obecnych w strukturze logicznej zdania ale pozbawionych warstwy artykulacyjnej) w odmianie języka angielskiego neutralnej pod względem stylistycznym i w socjolekcie przepisów kulinarnych. W związku z tym, że zdania zawierające określone dopełnienia domyślne są zazwyczaj niegramatyczne w pierwszej, ale nie w drugiej z tych odmian języka, warto zadać pytanie, skąd wypływają różnice obserwowane w ramach jednego języka oraz jakie czynniki decydują o odmienności socjolektów pod względem możliwości wystąpienia dopełnień domyślnych w konstrukcjach zdaniowych. Autorka stawia tezę, że niezgodność w dystrybucji dopełnień domyślnych w ogólnej odmianie języka angielskiego oraz omawianych w artykule socjolektach nie powinna być przypisywana różnicom w ramach systemu składniowego, lecz wynika z uwarunkowań procesów eksternalizacji języka w komunikacji.

1. INTRODUCTION

Investigations into the nature of intralinguistic syntactic variation in natural languages may focus on various questions, such as the questions about the locus of variation and the relationships between the phenomena considered to be marked and the linguistic patterns taken to be regular. The distinction between the core and the periphery of the grammar of a language has guided a line of research in syntactic theory which has led to some new insights into the nature of language-internal variation. The differentiation between the core and the periphery makes it possible to tease apart these data which are regular and seem to follow from the universal principles of grammar from the irregular and language-specific ones, whose presence in a particular language is taken to be accidental and conditioned by the history of the language.

One of the loci of syntactic variation in English is related to so-called *argument drop* observed in different stylistically-marked registers compared with what is found in the neutral variety used in everyday conversation. Even though dropping the subject or (specific) object usually leads to ungrammaticality ((1) and (2)), some situationally-motivated varieties make an extensive use of non-overt arguments, as shown in (3)-(7) from Ruppenhofer and Michaelis (2010: 159, 161):¹

- (1) *(They) like whisky.
- (2) They like *(whisky).
- (3) Sweet Lassi Ingredients:
 - 1 Serving Plain yogurt
 - 1 cup Sugar
 - 2 tablespoons Ice Cubes
 Method: Blend all the ingredients in an electronic blender. **Serve** Ø cold.
- (4) Check motor protection filter every time you change the paper filter bag. **Replace** Ø by a new one if it is very dirty.
- (5) Ø **Contains** alcohol.
- (6) Ø **read** Michelet; Ø **wrote** to Desmond about his poetess; L. out at Fabians; Ø **played** gramophone; ...
- (7) He **hammered** Ø wide of Gary Walsh's exposed net.

The examples in (3)-(7) illustrate the phenomenon of argument drop for the recipe register, product user manuals, label statements (*labelese*), the diary

¹ As is standard in theoretical linguistic literature, ungrammaticality is indicated with the symbol *, hence a bracketed expression prefixed with * designates impossibility of omitting the expression(s) in brackets; argument drop is indicated with Ø here.

register, and sports match reports, respectively. What examples like these demonstrate is that different grammatical options in a language may vary according to context of use. In this paper, the context specified by a collection of co-occurring features is taken to constitute a register. The term *register* has been assumed in Zwicky and Zwicky (1981) to refer to the conjunction of three main properties, namely the linguistic form (which consists of the orthographic, phonological, morphological, lexical, syntactic, or discourse-related specifications), the extra-linguistic context, and the function(s) of the linguistic forms in the specified contexts. By way of illustration, one of the linguistic features of the stylistically-marked registers exemplified above is the acceptability of non-overt arguments interpreted as having specific referents. The context is created by the limited set of situations in which a given example would be appropriate, such as a cookbook for (3) or a radio broadcast for (7). The function is in this case restricted to communicating a specific type of information, such as giving instructions about how to make or use a certain product ((3)-(4)).

The difference in the acceptability of *non-overt (missing) arguments* in the neutral register, which can be seen as belonging to the core grammar, and in the special registers, which belong to the periphery of English, shows that the register-related context of use influences linguistic choices and speaks to intralinguistic variation. To explore problems related to object drop in the core grammar and the periphery of English, this paper examines missing objects in the recipe register compared with the neutral register. I will try to show that the distinction between the core and the periphery of a language can serve to capture language-internal differences in the licensing conditions on object drop and that this phenomenon is related to the processes of the externalization of language rather than to the differences within the speaker's syntactic knowledge or syntactic competence.

The paper is structured as follows. In section 2, I outline the distinction between the core and peripheral grammar as conceived of within the generative approach to the study of language. In section 3, the empirical picture of object drop in English is presented with reference to the neutral variety and to the recipe register. Section 4 is concerned with different ways of capturing the periphery-related observations, which raise questions pertaining to the source of the intralinguistic variation investigated here. Concluding remarks are offered in section 5.

2. CORE AND PERIPHERAL GRAMMAR

The distinction between the *core* and *periphery* of a language has to be viewed against the background of the concept of Universal Grammar (UG), which is one of the building blocks of the generative framework. Generally

speaking, in the generative theory, the primary object of study are the unconscious mental states of knowledge of language rather than the external manifestations of these states.² UG is taken to be a mechanism specific to language (as opposed to other cognitive capacities), which constitutes a part of the genetic endowment of humans. Traditionally, UG has been assumed to contain a set of principles and parameters, the former being uniform across all possible languages and the latter providing a limited number of predetermined choices.³ For instance, that language is built from discrete units such as phonemes and words is a universal principle, whereas whether a sentence must have an overtly realized subject or not is a parameter, which has been taken to distinguish languages such as English, which (usually) do not tolerate null subjects in finite sentences ([–Null Subject]), from languages such as Polish, Italian, Chinese, etc., which do ([+Null Subject]). Principles together with the values of the parameters set as (+) or as (–) by exposure to a particular language have been taken to constitute the core grammar of the language. Linguistic facts not attributable to the mechanisms offered by UG have been viewed as following solely from the experience of a particular language and have been referred to as the periphery.

As Joseph (1992: 318/2000: 185) notes, one of the first studies concerned with the distinction between the core and peripheral grammar is Chomsky and Lasnik (1977), where, as noted above, the core is seen as the unmarked result of the options specified by UG and the periphery refers to these elements of grammar which result solely from experience. This distinction reflects the views that the manifestations of linguistic competence are a result of the interaction of the content of UG as shaped by linguistic data during the period of language acquisition and some accidental elements of a language, which are not predetermined by UG, as the following quote from Chomsky (1995) makes clear:

For working purposes (and nothing more than that), we may make a rough and tentative distinction between the *core* of a language and its *periphery*, where the core consists of what we tentatively assume to be the pure instantiations of UG and the periphery consists of marked exceptions (irregular verbs, etc.). Note that the periphery will also exhibit properties of UG (e.g., ablaut phenomena), though less transparently. A reasonable approach would be to focus attention on the core system, putting aside phenomena

² This distinction is referred to in the literature via the opposition of I-language (competence) versus E-language (performance).

³ In light of the recent developments in the generative linguistic theory, the appropriateness of this division and many related problems have become the subject of intense debate (cf., a.o., Boeckx 2010, Richards 2008, Sigurðsson 2010). As these issues are not of chief importance to the discussion in the present paper, they will not be considered in detail here. See Willim (this volume) for some discussion.

that result from historical accidents, dialect mixture, personal idiosyncrasies, and the like. (Chomsky 1995: 19-20)

The concepts of the core and periphery are more broadly discussed in Chomsky (1981), where the core is considered to be the system of grammar in an idealized speaker and the core and periphery taken together are seen as constituting the system of grammar represented in the mind of an individual acquiring a language within the context of a particular speech community. The ways in which the notion of the periphery has been described in the various stages of the generative paradigm have been summarized in Joseph (1992: 323-4, 2000: 190) in the following way:

- (8) The contents of the periphery in the Chomskyan paradigm:
 - a. marked; non-optimal in terms of evaluation metric (1977-1981)
 - b. what is added on after fixing of core grammar (1986)
 - c. syntactic analogue of irregular verbs (1977)
 - d. not determined by parameters of UG (1981, 1986)
 - e. examples: borrowings, historical residues, inventions (1981)
 - f. relaxing certain conditions of core grammar (1981, ?1982?, 1986)
 - g. process of analogy (1981)
 - h. exceptions, non-productive rules (1982)
 - i. examples: hierarchies of accessibility (1982)
 - j. examples: irregular morphology, idioms (1986)

Commenting on the above, Joseph suggests that introducing the notions of the core and the periphery conflates four types of distinctions made in linguistics, namely nature-convention, analogy-anomaly, synchronic-diachronic, unmarked-marked, and that the conception of the periphery is derived from the assumption that:

irregularity in language is the result of malfunction – unnatural process, psychological intervention, failure to observe core constraints fully or to abandon them fully when new core constraints are introduced. (Joseph 1992: 325/2000: 192, italics in original).

However, even though the peripheral elements of grammar are seen as resulting from accidental factors peculiar to individual languages, the periphery is still taken to be clearly structured or even related to the core in systematic ways. This view has been expressed in Chomsky (1982), who postulates that the marked conditions of the periphery are related to the core grammar by, for instance, relaxing some core grammar constraints. This way of perceiving the relation between the two components of the grammatical system of a language has led to criticism and to calling the appropriateness

of positing the distinction in the first place into question (cf., a.o., Joseph 1992, 2000).

From the point of view of language acquisition, the periphery is a necessary theoretical construct. It covers the set of linguistic data, such as irregular verbs and inflectional morphology, which must be learned solely on the basis of the input from the environment. In this connection, Goldberg (2003) criticizes the generative approach to the study of language and argues that the mechanisms employed in learning the peripheral phenomena can also be used to learn the core grammar, thereby making the distinction superfluous. However, Crain (2010) offers convincing arguments against Goldberg's conclusions from the structure of logical expressions in language. Furthermore, Yang (2010) argues that child language data speak to the issue of the core/periphery distinction, providing support for its purposefulness. Thus, it seems that the relation of the periphery to the core that is assumed in the study of natural language should not be taken to imply that there is no merit in distinguishing between the two.

The core/periphery distinction has also been applied to the study of the marked grammatical facts related to marked registers, which are incongruous with what is found in the neutral register. To show that the notions of the core and periphery do not only provide a way of analyzing the irregular elements which appear in a language, but that they can also prove relevant for capturing language-internal variation phenomena, the following section discusses the object drop data from the recipe register in comparison with the neutral register of English. The differences are then considered from the point of view of the distinction under discussion in section 4.

3. OBJECT DROP IN ENGLISH: THE EMPIRICAL PICTURE

As already noted, dropping a specific object in English leads to ungrammaticality, unless such an object appears in one of the stylistically marked registers. Even when object drop is possible under some conditions in the neutral variety of English, a clear difference in interpretation can be detected in the interpretation of null objects in a neutral and a special register, such as the recipe register, illustrated with the following examples from Massam and Roberge (1989: 137):

(9) Eat quickly! (we're in a rush)

(10) Remove cookies from oven. Eat quickly. (before they cool)

There seems to be a clear sense in which the overt realization of the object alters the interpretational properties of (9) but not of (10), as shown in (11) and (12), respectively:

(11) Eat them quickly! (we're in a rush)

(12) Remove cookies from oven. Eat them quickly. (before they cool)

When the object is not phonetically realized in a neutral context, the event described in the sentence is naturally interpreted as an activity ((9)), suggesting that in this situation there has been a shift from the accomplishment to the activity reading of the verbal predicate. Thus, (9) cannot be interpreted in the same way as (11), which clearly involves an accomplishment predicate. The same is not true of the omission of the object in the recipe register, as the object in (10), even though phonetically unrealized, is still understood as specific and is interpreted in parallel with the overt pronoun in (12). To understand the conditions on object drop in different linguistic and extra-linguistic contexts, the properties of object drop in the neutral register of English and in the recipe context are discussed in greater detail in sections 3.1. and 3.2., respectively.

3.1. Object drop in core grammar

Generally speaking, English makes it possible for objects to be dropped when they are interpreted as generic, as shown in (13) from Goldberg (2001: 506), or when the action described is habitual or iterative, as illustrated in (14) from Goldberg (2001: 507), and (15) and (16) from Mittwoch (2005: 246, 248):

(13) Tigers only kill at night.

(14) Scarface killed again.

(15) I usually buy in that shop.

(16) They murdered, raped, and plundered.

In all of the above examples, the objects are nonspecific and the backgrounding of information by the linguistic or extra-linguistic context facilitates the omission of the object and makes the recovery of the content of the object possible. For example, in (15) the type of the items bought would be indicated by a specific shop present in the context of the utterance.

By contrast, elements prominent in the discourse usually cannot be omitted from the phonetic representation of the sentence in English. This is illustrated by the impossibility of object drop in (17) from Goldberg (2001: 505):

(17) *The tiger killed.

Even construing the sentence so as to introduce the repeated reading of the action does not improve the acceptability of the definite object being left unpronounced, as (18) from Goldberg (2001: 508) illustrates:

(18) When it comes to tasty dusks, tigers love to kill *(them).

However, there are some contexts in which the omission of a definite object on the episodic reading is acceptable and can be contrasted with the omission of an unspecified object in a habitual context, as illustrated in (19) and (20) from Mittwoch (2005: 250):

(19) They attacked at night. (*non-iterative*)

(20) They usually attack at night. (*iterative/habitual*)

(19) stresses the importance of backgrounding, as the missing object must refer here to a group of people salient in the context. Additionally, some other restricted contexts make object drop possible even when the object is highly topical, as illustrated in (21) from Goldberg (2001: 515):

(21) A: Let's get all of these ugly dishes out of here before your date arrives.

B: OK, you break and I'll sweep.

What seems to license the omission of the object in this case is the implication of a repeated action and the contrast involved (cf. Cote 1996). This is indicated by the ungrammaticality of (22) from Goldberg (2001: 515), in which the lack of the paired action described by the second conjunct in (21) blocks object drop:

(22) Ok, you break *(them).

Thus, even though a definite object can be omitted in the stylistically-unmarked register in English in some cases, the above facts show that the phenomenon of dropping specific objects in the neutral register stands in contrast to what can be observed in some special registers.

3.2. Object drop in the periphery: the recipe register

Although not obligatory, the omission of objects in recipes is frequent, as the results of the corpus study of contemporary recipes conducted by Culy (1996) reveal: about 40% out of all objects were dropped in his corpus and about 80.4% if the ratio of missing objects to missing and pronominal objects taken together is considered to the exclusion of noun phrases. According to Zwicky and Zwicky (1981), recipes belong with the *telegraphic registers*, which are characterized mainly by deletion of elements, where the conditions on deletion are register-internal and subject to variation.⁴ That object drop is the

⁴ Other telegraphic registers considered in their paper are the diary register, telegraphese, labelese, product user manuals, and note-taking.

hallmark of the recipe register is best illustrated by the title of a novel by Cynthia P. Lawrence, *Chill before Serving: A Mystery Novel for Food Lovers*. As pointed out by Ruppenhofer and Michaelis (2010), the imperative construction with a non-overt object immediately evokes the notion of a recipe even outside of the cookbook context. Furthermore, as Haegeman (1987a) observes, the part of the material which is elided is not necessary for a successful interpretation of the instruction in recipe contexts.

Despite the fact that imperatives and missing objects seem to be a defining feature of the recipe register, as Zwicky and Zwicky (1981) note, cookbook writers may sometimes depart from using the register-characteristic constructions to include additional pieces of information, as demonstrated in (23):⁵

- (23) Heat the oil and butter in a frying pan until foamy, then fry the scallops for about 2 minutes a side. If you are using big scallops, then it is sometimes easier to cut them in half across. When they are cooked, they will have just lost their raw look in the middle and be lusciously tender, while golden and almost caramelized on the outside.

After the first sentence, which contains the features characteristic of the recipe register, what follows are sentences which do not involve either the imperative mood or missing objects but which serve to provide additional comments on the instructions.

3.2.1. Referential properties of missing objects

Regarding the interpretation of the missing objects in the recipe register, their reference is restricted to a very limited set of entities accessible in the discourse context. On the basis of his study of a corpus of texts of recipes, Culy (1996: 94) distinguishes the following types of possible denotata of the direct objects:

- (24) a. finished product: the subject of the recipe
 b. almost done: the stage at which there are no further ingredients to add
 c. working on: the stages from beginning to almost done
 d. other: this includes ingredients, pots, oven, etc.

Furthermore, the referents of the objects in recipe texts are in the common scope of interest and attention of the speaker and the hearer, which is why the omission of the object does not hinder communication.

⁵ (23) is taken from <http://www.nigella.com/recipes/view/SCALLOPS-WITH-THAI-SCENTED-PEA-PUREE-5314> [Date of access: April 2010].

3.2.2. Distribution of missing objects

Considering the environments in which objects can be unrealized phonetically, Culy (1996) points out that non-overt objects are found mostly with participles and imperatives and that they are the preferred option when the antecedent of the object is present in a preceding clause.⁶ Object drop seems to be disfavored with infinitives and tensed verb forms, but it is not completely impossible in these contexts, as shown in (25) from Culy (1996: 97):

- (25) At this point you may wrap shells airtight and store [Ø] at room temperature for up to 4 days or freeze [Ø] for longer storage.

In addition, missing objects can be accompanied by adjunct clauses and infinitival complements, as illustrated in (26) and (27) from Bender (1999: 65):

- (26) Bake Ø until golden brown.
(27) Allow Ø to cool.

However, there are some other grammatical features which have an influence on the distribution of missing objects by restricting the set of the environments in which they are licensed. For instance, it has been suggested in Ruppenhofer and Michaelis (2010: 4) that for registers to license argument drop, the argument has to appear in a specific construction, which is taken to be a condition on the non-overt realization of that argument. Consider (28):

- (28) What you want to do is this. You take the ingredients and blend *(them) for 10 minutes. Then you pour the mass into a pan and fry *(it) until it's golden brown. Then you take *(it) out of the pan and let *(it) cool for an hour. Finally, you serve *(it) cold.

According to Ruppenhofer and Michaelis (2010), the impossibility of leaving the object unrealized phonetically in the above example follows from the requirement that missing objects can appear only in imperatives that have non-overt subjects. Yet, it seems that a different explanation of the ungrammaticality of the missing objects in (28) might be more appropriate. In particular, the text in (28) does not seem to belong to the recipe register, as the introductory sentence seems to be characteristic of the conversational

⁶ Note that in register-neutral imperatives, object drop leads to ungrammaticality, as shown in (i) from Ruppenhofer and Michaelis (2010: 161, bold in original):

(i) **Take** *(the money) and run.

rather than the cookbook style. Furthermore, overt second person subjects are never found in instructional registers while (28) clearly illustrates an instruction, and thus (28) cannot be an example of the recipe register. Given that missing objects are licensed only in certain special registers, the unacceptability of the object drop in (28) is to be expected.

Moreover, as has been pointed out in Massam and Roberge (1989: 136), missing objects are ungrammatical in the double object construction:

- (29) Take cookies from oven. Give your guests *(these cookies) immediately.
 (30) Find the children. Give *(them) the cookies immediately.

It is plausible that this restriction is related to interpretive factors, as without both objects expressed overtly in the double object construction, the appropriate syntactic functions of the overt and the missing object might be difficult to identify with no overt evidence available to determine whether the missing argument functions as the direct or the indirect object of the verb.

Furthermore, object drop in the recipe context is restricted to the complements of verbs and is unacceptable, for instance, with complements of prepositions, as shown in (31) from Haegeman (1987a: 255), where the entire PP can be phonetically unrealized but the complement of the preposition cannot be deleted on its own:

- (31) a. Remove the vanilla pod from the mixture.
 b. Remove the vanilla pod.
 c. *Remove the vanilla pod from.

It seems that this effect might be attributable to the economy considerations, as prepositions select for the case of their complement, which is associated with the inherent theta-role that the preposition assigns to its complement. Hence, for sub-deletion to be possible, the preposition would have to be focused, which is not the case in (31).

Regarding the lexical constraints on the types of verbs whose objects may be unpronounced, Massam and Roberge (1989: 135) note that object drop is found with “affecting” and “non-affecting” verbs, such as ‘break’, ‘melt’, ‘put’ as well as ‘watch’, but is not permitted with perception or “psych” verbs, which they illustrate with the following examples:

- (32) Put pan over high heat and add water. *See/*Hear Ø boil before adding other ingredients.
 (33) Serve Ø with parsley garnish. Enjoy/*Like Ø as a main dish or as a side dish.

However, it seems that the situation here is similar to what has been suggested with respect to (28) above. Namely, perception and “psych” verbs are not usually used in recipes, which might imply that what rules out the examples in (32) and (33) is their inappropriateness within the given register. The recipe register is a style of language employed for describing activities that the addressee is expected to perform and thus stative verbs of perception and stative “psych” verbs have no use in recipe contexts. Thus, it seems that all verbs which naturally appear in recipes can be used with missing objects (cf. also Culy 1996).

3.3. Summary of contrastive observations

The above discussion aimed at pointing out some of the features of object drop in English. As was shown in section 3.1., the neutral variety makes it possible for a nonspecific object to be left unpronounced but it usually does not tolerate omission of objects with specific referents. By contrast, in the recipe register frequent use is made of specific non-overt objects and thus they can be considered one of the features characteristic of this register. This is why the examples in (34) and in (35) from Zwicky and Zwicky (1981: 537) can be easily identified as belonging to the recipe register and as being more appropriate in a conversation, respectively:

- (34) Cook slowly until tender, turning and basting occasionally, one to one and one-quarter hours.
- (35) Cook it slowly until it's tender, turning and basting it occasionally, for one to one and one-quarter hours.

As Cote (1996) notes, it seems that what licenses the availability of the missing object option is the possibility of associating the sentence with the recipe context rather than any specific feature of grammar or any lexical choices coinciding with it.

Furthermore, the referents of the nonspecific missing objects in the neutral register are identifiable on the basis of the semantics of the verb, as in (36), where the object is understood as denoting a meal:

- (36) I have already eaten.

On the other hand, the referents of the missing objects in recipes are always in the current focus of attention and their topical status enables the recovery of their content.

That such clear differences in the licensing of missing objects are found within one language raises important questions about the source of this variation and the ways in which the core constraints, whose effects are observed in the neutral register are related to the peripheral phenomenon of

object drop in the recipe register. These issues are the focus of the following section.

4. PERIPHERY AS A SOURCE OF VARIATION

As the comparison of the missing object-related data found in the neutral and the recipe registers of English indicates, constraints on licensing a linguistic phenomenon may differ significantly within one language. Various ways of capturing such discrepancies seem conceivable. For instance, intralinguistic variation may be seen as involving different grammars in the speaker's mind (cf., e.g., Eide and Åfarli 2008) or a subsystem of grammar available only in particular discourse contexts (cf., a.o., Culy 1996). Alternatively, intralinguistic variation can be taken to be related in some ways to the different settings of specific UG parameters or to the relaxation of the conditions imposed by these settings (cf., e.g., Haegeman 1987b, 1987c, 2006). As the latter options have been assumed in the context of the missing objects found in recipes, they are considered in greater detail in the next section.

4.1. Resetting/relaxation of a parameter

The possibility of analyzing language-internal variation as involving UG parameters has been pursued by Haegeman (1987b, 2006) in relation to argument drop in stylistically-marked registers of English, which she assumes to belong to the periphery of this language. In particular, she suggests that the parametric settings may be applied to analyzing intralinguistic variation, in addition to accounting for cross-linguistic differences. Following Huang (1984), Haegeman (1987b) adopts the distinction between *subject-prominent/sentence-oriented languages*, including Standard English and French, and *topic-prominent/discourse-oriented languages*, to which Chinese and Japanese belong. As topic-prominent languages can drop topical elements rather freely, Haegeman (1987b) suggests that the recipe register bears characteristics of the topic-prominent/discourse-oriented languages. Given that she assumes that subject- versus topic-prominence or sentence- versus discourse-orientation may be regarded as parametric choices, this makes it possible for her to propose that object drop in the recipe register results from the resetting of a parameter of UG.

Haegeman (2006) modifies somewhat her earlier views on register-specific parameter resetting by suggesting that argument drop phenomena in English should rather be perceived in terms of the relaxation of the conditions of the core grammar in peripheral constructions. In this scenario, the structures found in the special registers and ungrammatical according to the constraints imposed by the core grammar do not involve parameter resetting. This possibility is dismissed in relation to subject drop in the diary

register in English (cf. example (6) in the introduction) on the basis of the differences observed between the behavior of the null subjects in the diary register and unpronounced subjects in languages in which this property has been ascribed to a parameter within the generative tradition.⁷ In other words, since subject drop-related phenomena observed in the diary register in English differ from what is typically found in pro-drop languages, Haegeman (2006) proposes that register-specific data are due to the relaxation of the conditions imposed by a particular parametric setting rather than a change in the value of the parameter.

Importantly, Haegeman's (1987b, 2006) suggestions aim at explaining the peripheral argument drop phenomena by locating the source of the intralinguistic variation within the domain of the speaker's tacit syntactic knowledge. In what follows, I consider a different possibility of deriving the observed facts, which shifts the responsibility for the register-specific set of data from the state of knowledge of a language to the processes of language externalization in (interpersonal) verbal communication.

4.2. Variation as an externalization-related phenomenon

In the light of the previous discussion, I suggest here that the variation observed in the two registers considered in the present paper concerns only the different surface properties related to the phonetic realization of the object while the texts that belong to both registers are products of the same syntactic system in the speaker's mind. In other words, the state of UG employed in producing an utterance within the recipe context is the same as in the neutral context. The realization of the object as overt or non-overt is related to the ways in which the output of a syntactic computation transferred to the interface where it receives phonetic form is interpreted. On this assumption, the recipe register can be taken to make it possible for a specific object to be phonetically unrealized owing to the fact that it licenses such an option in the processes of the mapping of the abstract syntactic representation to sound/articulated form. It seems that restricting the locus of variation in the case under discussion to the processes of externalization is a consideration worthy of exploring in that it could capture the fact that the lexical choices and the grammatical structure available in the neutral and the recipe register seem to be the same. What is missing in recipes is the phonetic form of the object and this non-realization of the object is licensed by the specific properties of the register: in the situational context in which the instruction involving the specific object occurs, the object is *defocused*, which allows for other elements of the information structure of the utterance, specifically the verbal action itself, to become focal. In the reasoning suggested here, the peripheral phenomenon of specific object

⁷ This parameter is referred to as the *pro drop parameter* in the literature.

drop is a result of an additional option within the domain of externalization, which is (usually) not licensed in the core grammar contexts, hence it is a performance-related phenomenon.

5. CONCLUSION

In this paper, I have discussed the distinction between the core and periphery of a grammar of a language assumed in the generative theory of language in reference to the phenomenon of object drop in English. Even though the possibility of dropping specific objects is highly restricted in English, the fact that objects may (or even must) be unrealized in certain special registers illustrated here with the recipe register calls for an explanation. I have suggested here that the discrepancy between the core and peripheral object drop data could be seen as a result of the recipe context extending the range of externalization options by making it possible (and required for general reasons of economy) for a specific object to be unpronounced rather than as a result of the differences in the syntactic constraints that are part of the core grammar and of the periphery. The motivation for the non-pronunciation of topical objects comes from the preference for keeping computational complexity to its necessary minimum: elements present in the syntactic representation that is transferred for interpretation to the performance system (of sound) are assigned phonetic form only when indispensable. As the semantic content of missing objects in recipes is easily recoverable from the context of utterance, lack of phonetic realization of the object serves to direct attentional resources at new information, thereby facilitating requisite cognitive effects and efficient communication. Thus, in the context discussed here, intralinguistic variation can be taken to be located on the sound/performance side of language. However, a much wider range of language-internal variation phenomena must be investigated before a deeper understanding of the representation of situationally-motivated registers in an individual's mind and of the relation between the rules governing the core and periphery of a language can be gained.

REFERENCES

- Bender, E. (1999). Constituting context: null objects in English recipes revisited. *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics* 6: 53-68.
- Boeckx, C. (2010). What Principles and Parameters got wrong. ICREA/UAB ms.
- Chomsky, N. (1981). *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Chomsky, N. (1982). *On the generative enterprise: a discussion with Riny Huybregts and Henk van Riemsdijk*. Dordrecht: Foris.

- Chomsky, N. (1986). *Knowledge of language*. New York: Praeger.
- Chomsky, N. (1991). Some notes on economy of derivation and representation. In R. Freidin (ed.). *Principles and parameters in comparative grammar*. Cambridge, MA.: MIT Press. 417-454.
- Chomsky, N. (1995). *The minimalist program*. Cambridge, MA.: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, N., Lasnik, H. (1977). Filters and control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 8: 425-504.
- Cote, S. A. (1996). Grammatical and discourse properties of null arguments in English. Unpublished University of Pennsylvania PhD dissertation.
- Crain, S. (2010). What are core linguistic properties? In W. Christensen, E. Schier, and J. Sutton (eds.). *ASCS09: Proceedings of the 9th conference of the Australian Society for Cognitive Science*. Sydney: Macquarie Centre for Cognitive Science. 67-71.
- Culy, C. (1996). Null objects in English recipes. *Language Variation and Change* 8: 91-124.
- Eide, K. M., Åfarli, T. A. (2008). Dialect syntax and parallel grammars: a challenge to generative frameworks? Paper presented at NTNU, December 17-18, 2008.
- Goldberg, A. E. (2001). Patient arguments of causative verbs can be omitted: the role of information structure in argument distribution. *Language Sciences* 23: 503-524.
- Goldberg, A. E. (2003). Constructions: a new theoretical approach to language. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 7: 219-224.
- Haegeman, L. (1987a). Complement ellipsis in English: or how to cook without objects. In A. M. Simon-Vandenberghe (ed.). *Studies in honour of René De-rolez*. Ghent: University of Ghent. 248-261.
- Haegeman, L. (1987b). Register variation in English: some theoretical observations. *Journal of English Linguistics* 20: 230-248.
- Haegeman, L. (1987c). Complexity and literary prose: some suggestions for formalization. *Language and Style* 20: 214-222.
- Haegeman, L. (2006). Register variation: core grammar and periphery. In K. Brown (ed.). *Encyclopedia of language and linguistics*, 2nd ed. Oxford: Elsevier Ltd. 468-474.
- Huang, C.-T. J. (1984). On the distribution and reference of empty pronouns. *Linguistic Inquiry* 15: 531-574.
- Joseph, J. E. (1992). 'Core' and 'periphery' in historical perspective. *Historigraphia Linguistica* 19: 317-332.
- Joseph, J. E. (2000). *Limiting the arbitrary: linguistic naturalism and its opposites in Plato's Cratylus and modern theories of language*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Massam, D., Roberge, Y. (1989). Recipe context null objects in English. *Linguistic Inquiry* 20: 134-139.
- Mittwoch, A. (2005). Unspecified arguments in episodic and habitual sentences. In N. Erteschik-Shir and T. Rapoport (eds.). *The syntax of aspect. Deriving thematic and aspectual interpretation*. New York: Oxford University Press. 237-254.

- Richards, M. (2008). Two kinds of variation in a minimalist system. In F. Heck, G. Müller, and J. Trommer (eds.). *Varieties of competition*. Leipzig: University of Leipzig. 133-162.
- Ruppenhofer, J., Michaelis, L. A. (2010). A constructional account of genre-based argument omissions. *Constructions and Frames* 2: 158-184.
- Sigurðsson, H. Á. (2010). Conditions on argument drop. Lund University ms.
- Yang, C. (2010). Three factors in language variation. *Lingua* 120: 1160-1177.
- Zwicky, A. M., Zwicky, A. D. (1981). Telegraphic registers in written English. In D. Sankoff and H. Cedergren (eds.). *Variation omnibus*. Edmonton: Linguistic Research, Inc. 535-544.

Ewa Willim

Andrzej Frycz Modrzewski Krakow University

Jagiellonian University in Krakow

UNIVERSAL GRAMMAR, PARAMETERS OF VARIATION AND THE MORPHOSYNTAX OF WORLD ENGLISHES

STRESZCZENIE

Zarówno różnorodność języków, jak i wewnętrzne zróżnicowanie języka na odmiany i style rodzą pytania o naturę wariacji językowej. Praca omawia podejście do kwestii zróżnicowania językowego w językoznawstwie formalistycznym z kręgu Noama Chomsky'ego, w którym język jest jedną z kognitywnych zdolności człowieka, posiadającą genetycznie uwarunkowany stan początkowy, determinujący późniejsze stany nabyte. Uniwersalia językowe rozumiane jako zbiór formalnych cech leksykalno-gramatycznych oraz zbiór ogólnych, niewzruszonych zasad gramatyki każdego języka naturalnego określają zbiór możliwych języków naturalnych. Różnice językowe wynikają z różnic wartości parametrów zróżnicowania językowego i/lub z niepowtarzalności i arbitralności leksykonu, w tym morfologicznych wykładników uniwersalnych cech leksykalno-gramatycznych. Wariacji językowej nie można badać w oderwaniu od studiów nad uniwersaliami językowymi: zróżnicowanie językowe nie jest ani nieograniczone, ani nieprzewidywalne.

1. INTRODUCTION

Language is an important hallmark of the human species and a major transition in the evolution of life on earth. Involved in interpersonal communication, accumulation, storage and dissemination of information, social interactions, propaganda, transmission of culture and many other aspects of human activity, it plays a central role in the lives of human beings.

As an evolutionary transition, language has a biological basis and hence, at least some of its aspects must be coded in the genes, just as the communicative systems of many nonhuman animals must be coded in their genome. At the same time, human language is in some important respects unlike other systems for composing elements into combinations that have structural and informational properties. While many nonhuman animal species have been shown to have the capacity to acquire abstract concepts, no other animal system that allows for the externalization of ideas or messages has a human-like lexicon comprising tens of thousands of arbitrary learned symbols (words and morphemes) and a complex compositional syntax for arranging the symbols in combinations (phrases and sentences) (Hauser *et al.* 2002). The syntax of human language is generative: a finite number of structure-dependent grammatical rules can build an infinitude of novel sentences by applying recursively. The ability to use finite symbolic resources (vocabulary items and syntactic rules) to create an unbounded set of sentences that can be used freely to express informational contents in ways that are appropriate to the situation rather than random is uniquely human. This ability, sometimes referred to as the creative aspect of language, distinguishes human language from other infinite systems with compositional syntax, such as the genetic code, which also makes use of a finite set of elementary units (DNA bases) to create an infinitude of combinations (proteins) (Searls 2002). In contrast to human language, the units of the genetic code are not arbitrary and learned, and the process of making combinations from the units is not free, intentional and creative.

Just as language is a hallmark of the human species, structural complexity and the variability of language are its most important signatures. As Wolfram (2006: 333) puts it, “[i]f structure is at the heart of language, then variation defines its soul.” In one tradition of studies on language, the typological-functional tradition, which can be summarized with the statement that “languages can differ from each other without limit and in unpredictable ways” (quoted in Sampson 2009: 1) that was made by the linguist Martin Joos in his 1957 anthology entitled *Readings in linguistics*, languages are not born equal. The other influential tradition, the Chomskyan tradition of linguistics (Chomsky 1974, 1995), maintains that while languages are superficially remarkably different, all languages have interesting common structural properties that are not logically necessary. The principles and grammatical forces that drive such properties constitute the invariable core of human language called *Universal Grammar* (UG) and define the range of possible languages. Grammatical variation arises as a function of some variable choices that are embedded in the system of otherwise invariable UG principles.

The aim of this paper is to overview the ways in which the impressive range and the limits of grammatical variation have been rationalized in the

Chomskyan tradition of linguistics. The rest of this paper is structured as follows. Section 2 presents some arguments that have been put forward to show the extraordinary richness and complexity of human language and introduces the idea that human language has substantial abstract structure. Section 3 focuses on linguistic variability, highlighting the distinction between variation that exists across large groups of languages (*macro-variation*) and finer-grained variation found within homogeneous speech communities and/or within the grammars of individual speakers (*micro-variation*). The grammatical (morphological and syntactic) features that drive the finer-grained diversity within a single speech community underlying micro-variation are illustrated in reference to data from World Englishes in Section 4. Section 5 concludes.

2. THE STRUCTURAL COMPLEXITY OF HUMAN LANGUAGE

Chomsky (1975, 1995, 2007) distinguishes between two perspectives on language. On one, language is a mental state internal to each individual and it is for this reason called *I-language*. *I-language* is a computational system or mechanism that generates structured expressions. Each such expression is a set of instructions for the interface systems within which the language module is embedded in the brains/minds of speakers of a language. The representations that the computational system generates are constructed from observable data when utterances are processed and they are externalized in the production of utterances. At the same time, the representations generated by the computational system are used by the mental systems that underpin human thought. *I-language* is contrasted by Chomsky with language understood as the collection of all actual linguistic forms that speakers of a given language produce and process in acts of linguistic behavior. As this characterization is external or extensional, language so understood is called *E-language*. According to Chomsky, the object of linguistic theory is *I-language*, and more precisely, the human language faculty or UG. UG does not define one grammatical structure for all human languages. Rather, it contains the invariant principles of grammar formation, leaving certain other linguistic properties underspecified and hence a source of variation. The task of the child learning the language of his/her speech community is to fix the values of these variable choices on the basis of experience (i.e., exposure to observable data).

As Baker (2005) points out, there are two logical possibilities for how a full grammar of any particular language is constructed by the child in the process of acquiring a language. On one, UG specifies less information than is needed and the choices that are left open must be specified by the child on the basis of available data while on the other, UG provides too much

information by making available to the child a number of different possibilities to choose from so that the child's task is to reduce the options to one. In the first scenario, UG is like an unfinished story without the ending, which the child must "write" himself/herself to make the story complete so that it can be read by others in his/her linguistic environment whereby the child can understand others and be understood by others in his/her speech community. In the second scenario, UG is like an unfinished story that comes with several possible endings and the child's task is to choose the ending that fits the story that can be read by the members of the his/her speech community, e.g., English or Chinese.¹

Regardless which of the above scenarios proves to be adequate, it is clear that a theory of UG must offer a principled explanation for the richness and structural complexity of natural languages as well as for the fact that natural language syntax is a system generating hierarchically structured sound-meaning pairs. In other words, natural language syntax does not only generate representations of syntactic structure, it also determines the ways in which these representations are interpreted in the two extra-linguistic systems that the syntactic computational system interfaces with in the minds of the speakers of the language, the Sensory-Motor system

¹ The latter view of UG, known as the over-specification view of UG, has dominated the Government-Binding model of generative grammar in the 80s' and 90s' of the 20th century. In this model, UG is richly specified and has highly articulated modular architecture, being composed of various interacting components that constitute the internal knowledge of the idealized speaker of any language. Each module comprises its own vocabulary, rules, conditions, constraints and principles. This view of UG has changed in the current, minimalist framework of generative grammar, which attempts to reduce the computational system of generating hierarchically structured sound-meaning pairs to its bare minimum. As a result, the parameters of the Government-Binding model, which were at the heart of macro-variation, dividing languages into broad types, e.g., so-called head-initial languages like English, which are VO languages that also have prepositions, and so-called head-final languages like Japanese, which are OV languages with postpositions in place of prepositions, are currently viewed in terms of micro-variation, i.e., variation which reduces to the properties of (functional) lexical elements in natural languages. As on the micro-parametric approach to language typology all languages have underlying VO order, the difference between, e.g., VO and OV languages has to follow from the properties of the functional elements in the verbal domain, which must be responsible for the displacement of complements initially combined with their head to the right, but which surface to the left of the head verb (i.e., the underlying order is invariably VO, while the surface order is, again invariably, OV, in verb-final languages). This displacement is often observed across the other major syntactic categories of language, i.e., also NPs, APs and PPs, as will be discussed in the next section. As the nature of the trigger(s) for this displacement is unclear at the moment, in this paper I present the view that macro-parameters and micro-parameters can still be distinguished even if the difference between them is not as clear-cut as originally thought in the Government-Binding model (cf., also Baker 2008 for discussion).

in which syntactic structures receive their physical form (sound), and the Conceptual-Intentional system, where their interpretation (meaning) is worked out.

The linguistic knowledge of any language comprises knowledge of the rules for, roughly speaking, putting the words of the language in phrases and sentences. These rules are sensitive to the structural properties of the elements that are combined together, which explains why composing three identical elements in English, e.g., 'John', 'Mary' and 'kissed', yields two distinct grammatical sentences ('John kissed Mary' vs. 'Mary kissed John') depending on which element has the structural property of being the subject and which has the structural property of being the object. Structure-sensitivity of grammatical rules and operations also explains why different sentences made up of the same elements with the same structural properties can be mapped onto the same meaning (e.g., 'All the men have gone' vs. 'The men have all gone'). Thus UG must provide the general mechanism for combining elements together and specify the general conditions and constraints that this process must obey to be able to generate well-structured expressions of natural language that be easily interpreted in the interface components of the human mind, receiving appropriate physical form and conveying well-formed meanings. As pointed out above, the mechanism that generates combinations of linguistic elements must be structure-dependent, structure-dependence of syntactic rules thus being one important linguistic universal.

Furthermore, the combinatorial mechanism of language must be extremely powerful if it is to account for the infinitude of language. As native speakers of a language have intuitions of both syntactic well-formedness (acceptability) and syntactic ill-formedness (unacceptability), grammatical knowledge is the knowledge of both the possible and the impossible in a language. For example, although speakers of English can interpret the sentence in (2) and know that it expresses the same meaning as the sentence in (1), they know that (1) is grammatical and (2) is ungrammatical, which is indicated with the asterisk (*) in the latter:

- (1) John read the book.
- (2) *John the book read.

The grammatical principles underlying the speaker's knowledge of language are remarkably rich and generate not only sentences that are usable in linguistic behaviors, but also sentences which while grammatical are semantically incongruous (e.g., 'Colorless green ideas sleep furiously'), uninformative (e.g., 'All bachelors are male'), or which cannot be (easily) processed (e.g., 'The book that the publisher that the government funded published won the first prize').

The combinations of elements that the grammar, or more specifically, its syntax, generates are interpreted in the performance system of meaning that interfaces with the representations that are the output of the syntactic computational component of language. The structural complexity of language also manifests itself in native speakers' intuitions about the relationships between syntactic structure and semantic interpretation. For example, based on their knowledge of the types of events denoted by the verb 'to eat' speakers of English interpret the sentence in (3) to mean that John ate something or other, filling the empty position of the object with a kind of unspecified reference. In doing so, the speakers assign the sentence in (3) the same interpretation that they assign to (4). At the same time, while it is possible to fill the empty object position analogously in (5), which can be interpreted to mean that the lamb is so angry that it cannot eat anything, the interpretation of (6) cannot be enriched with a kind of unspecified reference despite the superficial structural similarity between these sentences. Rather, (6) has only the interpretation that the lamb is so clever that one cannot catch it (Chomsky 1995: 17):

- (3) John ate.
- (4) John ate something.
- (5) The lamb is too angry to eat.
- (6) The lamb is too clever to catch.

Data like the above show that speakers of a language have knowledge not only of the structural properties of the sentences of their language but also of their range of interpretations, and they know that certain meanings require certain grammatical structures rather than others. According to Crain and Nakayama (1987), this explains why speakers of a language, both children (four-year old) and adults, who do make mistakes when speaking, nevertheless never make certain types of mistakes. For example, speakers of English know that in sentences like (7) below, unlike in (8), the pronoun 'he' cannot be interpreted as referentially dependent on the noun phrase (NP) 'the Ninja Turtle', i.e., 'he' can take as its referent the referent of 'the Ninja Turtle' in (8), but not in (7).² The results of the experiment described in Crain and Nakayama (1987) suggest that neither adults nor children of about four years of age misinterpret the referential dependencies in sentences like these:

- (7) He danced while the Ninja Turtle ate the pizza.
- (8) The Ninja Turtle danced while he ate the pizza.

² In both (7) and (8), 'he' can refer freely, i.e., it need not depend for its reference on any NP in the sentence in which it occurs. This reading is not relevant for the present discussion.

Given that in structures like (10) below, the pronoun 'his' can be referentially dependent on the NP 'John', unlike in (9), where 'he' and 'John' cannot be co-referential, the conditions on referential dependence cannot be sensitive to linear order. Rather, referential dependence is determined in terms of a structural property of the expressions involved, called *c-command*. In English, like in many other investigated languages, a personal pronoun cannot be referentially dependent on the referent of a referring expression like 'John' if the referring expression should be a sister or be contained in a sister of the pronoun. (9) is ungrammatical with 'he' and 'John' interpreted as coreferential, because 'John' is contained within the sister of the subject pronoun, the projection that contains VP.³ By contrast, co-reference is possible in (10), because 'John' is not contained in the sister of the pronoun 'his', the sister of the pronoun 'his' within the subject NP ('his friends') being the noun 'friends'.

- (9) (*)He thinks that John will win the race.
 (10) His friends think that John will win the race.

To the extent that the pattern illustrated above recurs in language after language, *c-command* is a universal structural property of human language and may be expected to play a role in various other grammatically determined phenomena in a wide number, possibly all human languages (see Crain and Pietroski 2001 for discussion and Evans and Levinson 2009 for some dissenting comments). In fact, *c-command* has been argued to determine a wide range of syntactic phenomena with no semantic commonality, such as the distribution of negative polarity items like 'anything' in English, operator-variable dependencies, assignment of case, agreement phenomena, and others.

The complexity of language does not only lie in the compositional rules of syntax. For example, also the ways in which words are formed in language can be strikingly complex. In English, words may contain only the lexical root, e.g., 'uncle', but it is also possible to derive new words by composing together the lexical root with a number of distinct affixes, as e.g., 'antidisestablishmentarianism' illustrates. Compounding provides evidence that words can potentially be limitless. For example, the root 'great' can be compounded with the root 'uncle' infinitely many times, yielding 'great uncle', 'great great uncle', 'great great great uncle', etc. Polish, in which the function similar to that of the root 'great' can be performed by the prefix 'pra-', offers evidence that also affixation can yield potentially never-ending words in natural language, e.g., 'dziadek' ('grandfather'), 'pradzia-

³ Syntactic sisters can informally be defined as the immediate constituents of a larger constituent within which they are included. For example, the verb and its object, as immediate constituents of the including VP, are sisters.

dek' ('great grandfather'), 'prapradziadek' ('great great grandfather'), etc., even if the longest word (as well as the longest sentence) ever uttered by a speaker is finite in length.

Wrapping up, on the I-language approach to language, languages are properties of individuals. The individual language in a speaker's mind is due to interactions between the initial state of the linguistic faculty that the speaker is born with (UG) and his/her linguistic experience, that is the data that he/she is exposed to learning a language spoken in his/her speech community. As our life histories and experience with linguistic data are never quite the same, there are no two speakers of a language whose grammars or languages are identical. Rather, the individual languages mentally represented in the minds of the speakers are only more or less alike. However, being built out of the universal resources of the human faculty and hence sharing a common syntactic blueprint, all languages are in some respects the same and can be expected not only to show some invariant properties, but also some regularity in variation that is inherent to I-language.

3. CROSS-LINGUISTIC VARIATION

The clearest observable evidence for the richness and complexity of human language comes from the impressive range of variation that is found among the world's 6,000 or so languages. There are extensive differences both in the ways in which different languages build words and in the ways in which the words can be combined in phrases and sentences. For example, there are languages (ancient Chinese and modern Vietnamese, among others) in which words cannot be made from smaller parts, unlike in English and Polish. On the other hand, there are languages in which words can correspond to entire sentences in other languages. As illustrated in Baker (2001: 8), in Navajo, an American Indian language, a number of prefixes can be attached to a lexical root, as shown in (11) below, where six prefixes are attached to the root 'dlaad' ('to tear'), forming a rather complex word:

- (11) Ninááhwiishdlaad. (ni + náá + ho + hi + sh + ł + dlaad)
'I am again plowing.'

Languages also differ in how they build their phrases and sentences, e.g., while English builds bigger phrases by adding words on the left, Japanese adds words on the right:

- (12) [Hiro [showed [pictures [of himself] [to Hanako]]]]
(13) [Hiro [[Hanako-ni] [[zibun-no] syasin-o] mineta]]]
Hiro Hanako-to self-of pictures showed
'Hiro showed pictures of himself to Hanako.'

According to Baker (2001: 58), the difference between the Japanese and English sentences above, which are paraphrases of each other, has a very simple explanation. While both English and Japanese build prepositional phrases from NPs, the preposition is put before the NP in English ([of himself], [to Hanako]) and after the NP in Japanese ([zibun-no], [Hanako-ni]).⁴ While in both languages an NP can be formed by putting together a noun and a PP, English places the noun to the left of the PP ([pictures [of himself]]) while Japanese places the noun to the right of the PP ([zibun-no ('of himself')] syasin-o ('pictures'))). Furthermore, while in both languages a VP can be built by putting a verb together with an NP, the verb comes before the NP in English ([showed [pictures [of himself]]) and after the NP in Japanese ([zibun-no ('of himself')] syasin-o ('pictures')] mineta ('showed'))). Except for the subject position, on the surface a Japanese sentence is the mirror image of an English sentence in terms of the linear order of its constituents. Baker (2001, 2005) argues, however, that this great superficial dissimilarity is a result of a single difference in where a head is placed with respect to its complement. This difference, captured in terms of the Head Parameter, is a variable aspect of the universal principles of phrase structure that can determine the range of parametric differences in the phrasal structure of individual languages (but see note 1). If a language requires that the head must precede its complement, as English does, it is a *head-initial* language and it is expected to have prepositions like English (P + NP). If all heads follow their complements, as in Japanese, the language is *head-final* and it is expected to have postpositions rather than prepositions (NP + P). In fact, only 6% of the world's languages do not conform to the Head Parameter and are head-final languages with prepositions rather than postpositions (Baker 2001: 83), which shows that at least some linguistic variation is predictable rather than random, contrary to Martin Joos's assertion. In the 6% languages in which not all heads are final (verbs are, but prepositions are not), also the choice of the head categories is parametrized: some (kinds of) heads fall under one value of the parameter while other (kinds of) heads fall under the other value of the parameter. This need not present a problem for a child acquiring such a language in that the data necessary to make the requisite distinction are available to the child in his/her environment. Also a child learning English has to re-set the Head Parameter on the basis of the contrast between 'too quick/quickly' vs. 'strong/strongly enough', as unlike other degree words that combine with lexical adjectives and adverbs, 'enough' follows its complement and is perhaps the only head-final degree adjective/adverb in English.⁵ What this shows is that linguistic variation may

⁴ As a result, cognate lexical items are classified as prepositions in English and as postpositions in Japanese.

⁵ Alternatively, English is strictly head-initial so that all degree words occur phrase-initially in an adjective or adverb phrase. Regular degree words like 'very', 'too', 'that', etc., precede the adjective or adverb that they modify. By contrast, 'enough' as a de-

be lexically-based and idiosyncratic. If idiosyncratic, lexically-encoded features can cause syntactic variation that exists on a large scale between distinct languages, it may well be the case that all or most syntactic variation can be reduced to variation in the lexicon, in particular variation in morpho-syntactic features, and variation in how syntactic structure is spelled out in production (Chomsky 1995, 2007). In this scenario, there need not be a clear boundary between cross-linguistic (macro-variation) and language-internal variation (micro-variation).

4. MICRO-VARIATION:

THE MORPHOSYNTAX OF WORLD ENGLISHES

Micro-variation, i.e., variation within a homogeneous speech community, has traditionally been the focus of language typology, dialectology, ethnolinguistics and sociolinguistics (Chambers 2003, Biber 2006, Henry 2006, Wolfram 2006, Evans and Levinson 2009, among others). In dialectology, ethno- and sociolinguistics, language is studied mainly in its social/cultural context. The focus is on linguistic variation both across and within groups of speakers rather than on intrapersonal variation and on how observable linguistic variables relate to language-independent variables. A linguistic variable is any linguistic unit or relation (phonological, phonetic, morphological, lexical, syntactic, semantic and even pragmatic (e.g., speech act)) for which there are alternative realizations (variants). Independent non-linguistic variables include:

the traditional demographic variables (e.g., age, social class, region), constructed social groupings and practices of various types (e.g., communities of practice, social networks), interactional dynamics (e.g., power relations, solidarity), and even presentation styles and registers (e.g., performance, mimicking). (Wolfram 2006: 336)

The correlations are often studied in the context of language change in time. Contrary to the widely held assumption that linguistic variation

gree word is exceptional in triggering movement of the adjective or adverb to its left. This movement is a peripheral operation in English triggered by a specific particular item, unlike core, predictable syntactic operations of English, but its existence motivated by a single functional element in a single language that otherwise does not offer evidence for such movement suggests that word order variation may arise not only as a result of certain types of heads (e.g., all or some lexical categories) systematically requiring that their complements be reordered in the syntax, but also (or perhaps only) as a result of idiosyncratic properties of individual (functional) lexical elements.

reflects social heterogeneity, it has been shown that not all members of a speech community exhibit similar linguistic behaviors and there may be considerable inter- as well as intra-speaker variation within linguistically and socio-economically homogeneous communities that are also unrelated to differences in sex, style and social networks (Dorion 1994). Thus, not all linguistic heterogeneity is correlated with social heterogeneity. Rather, at least some linguistic variation that exists within individual mental grammars cannot be explained in terms of group norms (Wolfram 2006).

Grammatical (morphosyntactic) variation has not been the focus of studies on micro-variation. The reason is quite simple: morphosyntactic variables are not common and significantly more data than are usually considered in studies on phonological variation and change are needed to establish morphosyntactic variables and to correlate them with sociolinguistic and stylistic variables. At the same time, morphosyntactic variation, often associated with semantic differences, raises some important and difficult questions for the very notion of 'linguistic variable' and this may also be a reason why morphosyntactic variation has been out of the limelight in variationist literature. However, morphosyntactic variation is of utmost importance for theoretical models of linguistic variation and change as well as for sociolinguistics, especially that its existence has been claimed to stratify social groups more sharply than phonological variation (Chambers 2003: 57).

Computerized corpora have recently made possible large-scale quantitative inquiry into the most common patterns of variation as well as the distinctive properties of individual non-standard varieties. The results of the survey of grammatical variation in present-day regional dialects of English conducted on a database embracing 46 varieties of English spoken around the globe presented in Kortmann and Szmrecsanyi (2004) reveal a wide range of linguistic differences between English speakers worldwide. Among the 76 features on which the quantitative inquiry was based, most are concerned with the expression of morphosyntactic categories such as nominal number, person and gender, adjectival grade, as well as tense, aspect, modality, and intrasentential grammatical phenomena such as subject-verb agreement and subordination. The syntactic variables concerned the syntax of interrogative sentences and relativization strategies (e.g., the use of 'that' in non-restrictive relative clauses, the use of 'what' and 'as' as relative pronouns, zero-relativization in subject position, none of which is part of standard British English).⁶

According to Kortmann and Szmrecsanyi (2004), the morphosyntactic features that speakers of non-standard English exploit are either fea-

⁶ The differences in the relativization strategies that involve (functional) lexical elements discussed in Kortmann and Szmrecsanyi (2004) resemble some of the grammaticalization processes observed by Freundlich (this volume).

tures that were found in earlier periods of standard English (e.g., 'never' as a marker of sentential negation and multiple negation/double negative concord illustrated in Table 1 below), or they are innovative features that cannot be traced back in the history of English (e.g., loss of subject-verb agreement). The top 11 features of World Englishes are presented in Table 1, where the numbers in the left-hand column give the number of the languages in the sample of 46 varieties of English in which the variables are attested:

Table 1. Worldwide top 11 morphosyntactic variables of non-standard English (Kortmann and Szmrecsanyi 2004: 1154)

41	lack of inversion in main clause <i>yes/no</i> questions <i>You get the point?</i>
40	<i>me</i> instead of <i>I</i> in coordinate subjects <i>Me and my brother/My brother and me were late for school.</i>
40	<i>never</i> as preverbal past tense negator <i>He never came</i> (=He didn't come.)
39	adverbs same form as adjectives <i>He treated her wrong right from the start.</i>
37	absence of plural marking after measure nouns <i>four pound, five year</i>
36	lack of inversion/lack of auxiliaries in <i>wh</i> -questions <i>What you doing?</i>
35	multiple negation/double concord <i>He won't do no harm.</i>
35	degree modifier adverbs lack <i>-ly</i> <i>That's real good.</i>
34	special second person plural forms <i>youse, y'all, yufela, you...together, you ones/'uns, you guys, you people</i>
34	levelling of difference between Present Perfect and Simple Past <i>Were you ever in London? Some of us have been to New York years ago.</i>
34	double comparatives and superlatives <i>That's so much more easier to follow.</i>

Interestingly, with respect to most present-day morphosyntactic phenomena, non-standard varieties of English are on the whole more regular and consistent than standard (British or American) English. For example, non-standard varieties of English worldwide have fewer irregular verbs; present tense distinctions are regularized in that either the affix '-s' is generalized to all persons in SG and PL or it is eliminated from verb inflection in present tense altogether; reflexive pronouns are regular in that in all persons the reflexive is built from a possessive pronoun and 'self/selves'

(hence, 'hissel' and 'theiressel' rather than 'himself' and 'themselves'); the morphologically-encoded distinction between adjectives and adverbs is leveled, which is welcome from the semantic point of view as both adjectives and adverbs are primarily modifiers and hence have a single semantic function to play in language; 'ain't' used as a universal marker of negation neutralizes the distinction between 'don't/doesn't/didn't', etc. Considered from a typological perspective, the non-standard varieties display some of the patterns that are found in other languages (e.g., the Present Perfect/Simple Past distinction that is gradually being neutralized in the non-standard varieties of English is typologically rare). It may be added that also lack of auxiliary inversion in interrogative sentences, which is the most common syntactic feature of non-standard regional varieties of English and which is found in child English (Henry 2006), is also typologically common, and that nouns occurring in counting constructions with numerals are not number-specified in many languages, including Hungarian, Persian and Chinese. Summing up, what Kortmann and Szmrecsanyi's (2004) study demonstrates is that most grammatical variation in present-day English dialects is idiosyncratic in that it is mostly morphological in nature. The principles for combining a verb and its object or a preposition with its complement are not variable in English: there is no variety of English in which (2) would be grammatical and there is no variety of English in which (13) would be a grammatical structural variant of (12). At the same time, the variable features of English morphosyntax are among the most common inflectional categories found across languages, that is the grammatical features specified by UG that encode universal syntactic categories and relations. Thus, morphosyntactic variation can (all) be related to the properties of the lexicon of grammatical (morphosyntactic) categories. Adger and Smith (2010) argue that such variability is caused by differences in the featural specification of grammatical categories and/or underspecification in the mapping between morphosyntactic features and the morphological forms that realize them.⁷ For example, the variation in subject-verb agreement found in the variety of English spoken in the town of Buckie in North-East Scotland and demonstrated with the variability in the past tense of the verb 'be' in Table 2 can be accounted for on the assumption that agreement is determined by grammatical rules (or algorithms) that match features of lexical items with morphological forms (Adger and Smith 2010: 1111).⁸

⁷ Variation can also arise as a result of particular lexical items triggering movement, as discussed earlier in reference to the contrast in the placement of degree words relative to adjectives and adverbs (e.g., 'too/very/quite fond of music' vs. '*fond too/very/quite of music' and '*enough fond of music' vs. 'fond enough of music').

⁸ The fact that 'they' as subject never controls agreement with 'was' and that 'I' never controls agreement with 'were' shows that it cannot simply be said that in Buckie, 'were' and 'was' are two alternative forms realizing the past tense forms of 'be' in the context of a pronominal subject.

Table 2 Buckie English pronominal subject-verb ('be') agreement in the past tense

I was	We was/were
You was/were	You (ones) was/were
He/she/it was	They were

Among the features relevant to the agreement process(es) are nominal features, e.g., the features that (subject) pronouns can be decomposed into (i.e., [singular: ±], [participant: ±], and [author: ±]), as well as verbal features (e.g., [present: ±]). The rules of linking morphosyntactic features with morphological spell-outs that Adger and Smith (2010: 1126) propose for 'be' in the past tense in Buckie English are given in Table 3 below:

Table 3 The mapping between feature structures and morphological forms: variable agreement with 'be' in the past tense in Buckie English (Adger and Smith 2010)

Feature structure	Form
a. [singular: +, present: -]	<i>was</i>
b. [singular: -, present: -]	<i>were</i>
c. [participant: +, present: -]	<i>was</i>
d. [author: -, present: -]	<i>were</i>
e. [author: +, present: -]	<i>was</i>
f. [pronominal: -, present: -]	<i>was</i>

If a pronominal second singular subject ('you') is analyzed as a complex of the features [singular: +, participant: +, author -], it controls agreement with 'was' by two rules given in Table 3: rule (a) and rule (c); however, it also controls agreement with 'were' by the rule (d). Hence, the grammar correctly specifies two variants of subject ('you')-verb ('be') agreement in the past tense. That one variant is determined by two rules while the other only by one rule predicts uneven distribution, which is in fact empirically verified with 'was' occurring more often in the corpus in the context of the subject 'you' than 'were'. At the same time, as a third person plural 'they' is decomposed into [singular: -, participant: -, author: -], it can only control agreement with 'were', as among the rules that determine the spelling-out of 'be' in the past tense, the features of 'they' activate rules (b) and (d), both of which determine 'were' as the spell-out of 'be' in the past tense. Thus, the underspecification in the mapping between feature structures and morphological forms, which results in a grammatically determined pool of variants, can correctly capture variability in the agreement between

pronominal subjects and 'be' in the past tense and can constitute a formal method for analyzing morphosyntactic variability of this kind in natural language. Linguistic change may be analyzed as resulting from changes in feature structures and the rules mapping them onto morphological forms that happen over time. At the same time, where there is a pool of variants, the choice of a variant in a given context of utterance can be expected to depend on a variety of factors, e.g., its phonology, sociolinguistic status, expectations about appropriateness, ease of lexical access, etc. In this scenario, while the grammar itself may be blind to usage-related information, to the extent that it determines a pool of variants spelling-out the same grammatical forms interpreted to have the same meanings, it is in principle compatible with variability and in fact provides its users with the possibility of choice in the complex and changing conditions of verbal communication.

5. CONCLUSIONS

The main problem addressed in this paper is one of the fundamental problems in linguistic theory, namely, what sense should be made of the impressive range of human languages when languages play an equal role in the lives of all speakers, regardless the individual language they happen to speak. One tradition of rationalizing the diversity of human language, the Chomskyan view, takes language to be the internal property of its users, which is shaped by features common to all individual languages and which inherently defines some margin of variation. Syntactic variation, typically observed across languages but found also within the grammars of individual languages, is determined by some variable choices encoded in the lexical items and by the sensitivity of some (peripheral) grammatical operations to the properties of such items. Morphosyntactic variation is a result of idiosyncratic differences in the ways in which the universal set of grammatical features, including person, number, case, tense, aspect, mood, negation, etc., is realized morphologically (if it is realized at all) across languages and within a single language. The variants that are produced by the grammar of an individual language that is embedded in a performance model are sensitive to all sorts of usage-related factors, both in-group and individual or personal, such as sociolinguistic connotations and judgments of appropriateness, probability and frequency of particular forms, individual preferences, etc. However, despite variation both across languages and within a single language, languages and their varieties do not differ from each other randomly and without a limit. If they did, it would be hopelessly mysterious just how Navajo Code Talkers, a group of young men who during WWII created and used the most successful code in military history, the only code in modern military history that has

never been broken by enemy intelligence (Japanese), could code military transmissions written in English with perfect accuracy into Navajo-based messages that were indecipherable to the Japanese military. As observed by Baker (2001), that the Japanese intelligence could never break down the Navajo-based code shows that Navajo, on which the code was based, must be remarkably different from Japanese and any other language known to the Japanese intelligence at the time. While at the same time Navajo is remarkably different from English (cf. (11)), the overall architecture of Navajo and English (as well as Japanese) must be sufficiently similar to have made it possible for Navajo Code Talkers, speakers of both English and Navajo, to translate from English into the Navajo-based code and from that code back into English. If languages differed randomly and unpredictably, it is hard to imagine how this could ever be achieved.

REFERENCES

- Adger, D., Smith, J. (2010). Variation in agreement: a lexical feature-based approach. *Lingua* 120: 1109–1134.
- Baker, M. (2001). *The atoms of language*. New York: Basic Books.
- Baker, M. (2005). The innate endowment for language: overspecified or underspecified? In P. Carruthers, S. Lawrence and S. Stich (eds.). *The innate mind: structure and contents*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 156–174.
- Baker, M. (2008). The macro-parameter in a microparametric world. In T. Biberauer (ed.). *The limits of syntactic variation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 351–373.
- Biber, D. (2006). Register: overview. In K. Brown (ed.). 476–482.
- Brown, K. (ed.) (2006). *The encyclopedia of language and linguistics*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Chambers, J.K. (2003). *Sociolinguistic theory*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Chomsky, N. (1975). *Reflections on language*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Chomsky, N. (1995). *The minimalist program*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, N. (2007). Approaching UG from below. In U. Sauerland and H. Gärtner (eds.). *Interfaces + recursion = language? Chomsky's minimalism and the view from syntax-semantics*. Berlin: Mouton. 1–29.
- Crain, S., Nakayama, J.M. (1987). Structure dependence in children's language, *Language* 62: 522–543.
- Crain S., Pietroski, P. (2001). Nature, nurture and Universal Grammar. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 24: 139–186.
- Dorian, N. (1994). Varieties of variation in a very small place: social homogeneity, prestige norms and linguistic variation. *Language* 70: 631–696.
- Evans, N., Levinson, S. (2009). The myth of language universals. Language diversity and its implications for cognitive science. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 39: 429–492.

- Hauser, M., Chomsky, N., Fitch, W.T. (2002). The faculty of language: what is it, who has it, and how did it evolve? *Science* 28: 1569–1579.
- Henry, A. (2006). Microparametric variation. In K. Brown (ed.). 124–128.
- Kortmann, B., Szmrecsanyi, B. (2004). Global synopsis: morphological and syntactic variation in English. In B. Kortmann *et al.* (eds.). *A handbook of varieties of English*, vol. 2. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 1142–1202.
- Sampson, G. (2009). A linguistic axiom challenged. In G. Sampson, D. Gill and P. Trudgill (eds.). *Linguistic complexity as an evolving variable*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1–18.
- Searls, D. (2002). The language of genes. *Nature* 420: 211–217.
- Wolfram, W. (2006). Variation and language: overview. In K. Brown (ed.). 333–340.

NOTES ABOUT AUTHORS

Dr Marta Dąbrowska is Senior Lecturer in the Institute of English Studies at the Jagiellonian University in Krakow as well as active translator. She obtained her MA and PhD at the Jagiellonian University. Her PhD dissertation was a contrastive study of expressions of politeness in English and Polish. She lectures on sociolinguistics and history of the English language. Her main fields of interest concern genderlect studies, the language of the electronic media, linguistic sexism, language attitudes, pragmatics and language contact, with a particular focus on the phenomenon of code-switching and new varieties of English. She has authored numerous papers and translated many academic works in the field of linguistics.

Dr Jerzy Freundlich is Lecturer in English Philology at Andrzej Frycz Modrzewski Krakow University. He obtained his BA and PhD (in comparative syntax) from the University of London. His main area of research interest is linguistic change in British English, particularly with respect to grammar and phonology.

Iwona Krok, MA graduated from the Institute of Russian Philology at the Undergraduate Vocational State School in Nowy Sącz with BA and received her MA in Russian from the Jagiellonian University in 2010. Her dissertations were concerned with English borrowings in contemporary Russian, a topic which is her main research interest.

Dr Krzysztof Ozga is Senior Lecturer in the Institute of East Slavonic Philology at the Jagiellonian University in Krakow. He holds a double MA in Russian and in English. His PhD dissertation was devoted to the isomorphism of Russian, Polish and English adverbs within the framework of communicative grammar. His main research interests include: semantic syntax, pragmatics, systemic functional linguistics, and cognitive linguistics. He is a member of

International Systemic Functional Linguistics Association and Secretary to the Editor of the *Bulletin de la Société Polonaise de Linguistique*. His recent publications include the monograph entitled *On isomorphism and non-isomorphism in language*, published by Primum Verbum in 2011.

Marta Ruda, MA is currently a PhD student at the Faculty of Philology, the Jagiellonian University in Krakow. She received her MA in English from the Jagiellonian University in 2010. In 2011, after completing an undergraduate program at the Chair of Hungarian Philology, she also received a BA degree in Hungarian from the Jagiellonian University. Her special area of interest includes the syntax of natural languages within the generative framework, with the empirical domain of her research centering on English, Polish, and Hungarian.

Dr hab. Ewa Willim is Associate Professor of Linguistics in the Institute of English Studies at the Jagiellonian University in Krakow and at Andrzej Frycz Modrzewski Krakow University. She graduated with MA from the Jagiellonian University and from the University of Connecticut, USA. Her PhD dissertation was the first study of Polish syntax in the Government-Binding model of generative grammar. Its shortened version entitled *On word order: a Government-Binding study of English and Polish* was published by the Jagiellonian University Press in 1989. She is also the author and co-author of several other books and textbooks and numerous articles published in scholarly journals in Poland and abroad. Her main research interests include: generative theory of syntax, syntax-semantics interface, the language-cognition relation as well as English-Polish contrastive grammar.

Dr Marcin Zabawa is Senior Lecturer in the Institute of English at the University of Silesia. In his PhD dissertation, he examined how English influences the lexis of spoken spontaneous Polish. He is essentially a corpus linguist whose main research interests include English-Polish language contact, borrowings, the language of the Internet, the mechanisms of semantic change, and the influence of English on Polish and other European languages. He also has an interest in the translation of literary texts, with special emphasis on the classification of linguistic and translation errors in the native (target) language.