IRIS AperTO

UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI TORINO

AperTO - Archivio Istituzionale Open Access dell'Università di Torino

Functional markers in llanito code-switching. Regular patterns in Gibraltar's bilingual speech

This is the author's manuscript

Original Citation:

Availability:

This version is available http://hdl.handle.net/2318/1689616 since 2019-02-04T14:56:52Z

Publisher:

John Benjamins

Published version:

DOI:10.1075/slcs.186.17gor

Terms of use:

Open Access

Anyone can freely access the full text of works made available as "Open Access". Works made available under a Creative Commons license can be used according to the terms and conditions of said license. Use of all other works requires consent of the right holder (author or publisher) if not exempted from copyright protection by the applicable law.

(Article begins on next page)

12 July 2024

Functional markers in llanito code-switching. Regular patterns in Gibraltar's bilingual speech

Abstract

Several studies have demonstrated that, in situations of language contact, discourse markers, pragmatic markers and modal particles are easily transferable from one language into the other. This contribution tries to examine how does this process take place in bilingual speech, and it discusses data from a corpus of bilingual conversations from Gibraltar. It is argued that switching of discourse and pragmatic markers, as well as modal expressions, is an extremely frequent phenomenon and, more interestingly, that regularities in this process can be found, in the form of regular and recurrent bilingual patterns. These functional elements in fact are shown to behave consistently with each other, allowing to identify class-specific patterns, and with other discourse-relevant entities such as left dislocations and pseudo-clefts.

1 Introduction: Functional markers in bilingual speech

In this paper we aim at describing the behaviour of discourse markers, pragmatic markers and modal particles (respectively DMs, PMs and MPs henceforth) in code switching. Instead of addressing a subtle internal subcategorization of each class, we mean to account for the emergence of regular bilingual patterns involving such items as a unique class, and alongside with other functional and discourse-relevant elements, which fall outside the definition.

In our account we will borrow from Molinelli (2014), Ghezzi & Molinelli (2014), Ghezzi (2014) the term *functional markers* as a cover term for a wide set of items that, regardless of their internal complexity and their degree of grammaticalization, express pragmatic, non truth-conditional values of the

utterance. As the authors propose, we consider a three-way distinction inside this set, corresponding to three basic functional domains: PMs are related to the management of an ongoing interaction, and include markers like attention getters and turn yelding devices. DMs have the function of expressing textual and "intra-discourse" (Ghezzi 2014: 15) relations between utterances; they include for example quotation markers. With MPs we refer to a set of markers whose function is to express the speakers' stance towards the utterance; their meaning is thus *subjective* in the sense of Traugott (2010). In this paper, markers related to the expression of modality in the sense of Bybee & Fleischmann (1995) as well as items marking the illocutionary force of the utterance have been considered as part of this class.

At the same time, and on a wider perspective, the class of functional markers can in turn be considered among the structures operating at the discourse level and outside the clause (see Kaltenböck, *et al.* forth.). They are thus regarded here as one type of *extra-clausal constituents* (Dik 1997) and part of *thetical grammar* (Kaltenböck *et al.* 2011, Heine 2013). Such discourse-oriented models are particularly useful in that they allow to compare the behavior of functional markers with a wider set of discourse-relevant items such as interjections, formulae of social exchange, comment clauses and conjunctions, whose status as functional markers would be at least problematic.

Functional markers have also been a largely studied topic in contact linguistics: several works have shown that elements pertaining to the discourse dimension tend to behave coherently in a given situation, and are generally more exposed to contact than clause-internal items. Matras (1998) argues thus for the existence of a *principle of pragmatic detachability*, according to which all items that can be detached by the propositional content of the utterance, and which normally express pragmatic meaning, tend to be borrowed before and more frequently than clause-internal elements; such items are thus included in a functional class of *utterance modifiers.* On a totally different basis, Maschler (1994, 1998) identifies the rationale for the bilingual patterns involving functional markers (*discourse markers* in her account) in the need for an iconic separation between activities of *languaging* and *metalanguaging*, ie. "communicating about the process of languaging". Regardless of specific approaches, language contact appears in all cases to be a privileged ground to study functional markers, since it highlights similarities and differences with other types of expressions operating at the discourse level.

In this study we follow the contact-based perspective sketched above, and our goal is to investigate how functional markers fit into these more general tendencies. However, while most of the past studies have focussed on structural phenomena such as lexical borrowing, we mean to address functional markers from the perspective of code switching (CS) as a performance phenomenon. In a highly general sense, code switching involves

the "juxtaposition within the same speech exchange of passages of speech belonging to two different grammatical systems or subsystems" (Gumperz 1982: 59). In particular, we will look more closely at a particular phenomenon in bilingual speech, related to Auer's (1999, 2014) notion of *fusion*: this process involves the increasing obligatoriness of CS at particular points, and the surfacing of regular bilingual patterns, which arbitrarily constrain the virtually unlimited possibilities of bilingual speech. In some extreme cases, the spread over the linguistic community of such patterns can represent the incipient stage in the formation of a new bilingual code characterized by its own set of norms.[1] This particular situation has been accounted for by several authors in the past decades, and matches definitions such as *code switching as the unmarked choice* (Myers-Scotton 1993), *code switching mode* (Poplack 1980), *code switching style* (Gumperz 1964) and so on. More recently, and with the same meaning, the expression *mixed code* has come into use, for example in Maschler (1998), Oesch Serra (1998) and Muysken (2007).

Unlike conversational CS (see Auer 1995), in mixed codes the single switches do not convey any particular conversational meaning and do not serve any local pragmatic function: on the contrary, the use of two languages is "globally meaningful" (Auer 1999: 310), as opposed to monolingual conversation. In other words, while conversational CS is relevant for the

[1] With reference to Álvarez-Cáccamo (1998) we use the term 'code' in the sense of systematic co-occurrences at the level of language use, as opposed to 'language variety', which on the other hand is defined as a set of co-occurrences at the system level.

organization of a specific piece of conversation, as in (1), in a mixed code, social meaning is achieved by the sole use of particular bilingual patterns, as in (2).[2]

(1) T: let me hear what J says // where the lights are // what do you call that //

J: *lampara*

'street lamp'

T: *no no* // *como le llama' tu a eso* // *donde 'stan la' luce'*

'no no, how do you call that, where the lights are'

(2) *rosto dice* mum *dice e'to é:* / italian // because we know it as *rosto* / *pero* it's just another *dice* typical food / i don't know from some / region in italy

'rosto, says he, mum*, says he, this is* Italian. Because we know it as *rosto but* it's just another, *says he*, typical food, I don't know from some region in Italy'

As Muysken (2007) pointed out, mixed codes can emerge from a wide set of different situations, and be characterized by different structural features. One of these is precisely the formation of stable switching patterns between the clause and the functional markers attached to it. We will then further explore this possibility, asking in which ways functional markers can contribute in the formation of a mixed code, and how do they fit into more general tendencies where other discourse-relevant function words are involved.

In section 2 we give a short description of the main features of bilingual speech in Gibraltar, and in particular we introduce our main focus: emerging bilingual patterns involving a clause and various types of extra-clausal

[2] Where not differently indicated, the cited materials are part of the author's fieldwork data; see Section 2 for further details.

constituents. In section 3 we discuss the issues related to PMs, and in particular we take into account the case of *no* and *mira.* Section 4 is dedicated to patterns involving discourse markers proper, which express textual relations: after an account of universally recognized DMs such as *dice* for quotations and *bueno* for self-corrections, we focus on the behavior of less grammaticalized connectives of the *es que* type. Finally, section 5 deals with MPs, which correspond here to that set of functional markers expressing the most clause-internal or speaker-oriented functions, and include modality markers and illocutionary markers. In section 6 we address a final discussion and we sum up our conclusions.

2 Data and methods

2.1 Code switching in Gibraltar

Our account of DMs, PMs and MPs is based on the analysis of a corpus of bilingual interviews collected in Gibraltar in April and November 2013[3].

[3] The corpus consists of nearly 20 hours of recordings. The sample was designed to represent three age brackets, namely young (younger than 30 years old), adult (between 30 and 60 years old) and elderly speakers (over 60 years old) and collects interviews with a total of 54 Gibraltarian men and women. The informants, who were often recruited with the help of local institutions like Gibraltar Garrison Library and Gibraltar Heritage Trust, were requested to speak about facts related to local history, as well as to comment on present issues like, for example, alcohol and drug abuse by Gibraltarian teenagers. The speakers were asked to answer the questions in the language they felt more comfortable with, sometimes referring to the ethnic name llanito; the interviewer on the other hand stated that he was able to understand both English and Spanish and accommodated the speakers' language choice.

Gibraltar was chosen mostly because of its unique sociolinguistic features, which have been already accounted for in Kramer (1986, 1998), Kellerman (2001), Levey (2008*a, b*), Lipski (1986), Moyer (1998, 2000), Goria (2015, forthcoming). In this setting, English is the only official language, and it is used both in formal and official situations, and in informal conversation. More precisely, alongside with Standard English, a local non-standard variety has developed, which is called Gibraltarian English. A local Spanish dialect, structurally similar to those spoken in the neighbouring region of Southern Andalusia, is also used in informal contexts by the majority of the population; for this variety we will use the term 'Gibraltarian Spanish'. The whole repertoire can thus be accounted for as a case of *dilalia* (see Berruto 1987, 1995 *inter alia*), where British English constitutes the H end, and the local varieties of English and Spanish constitute the L end of the continuum. In this setting, code switching occurs as a regular practice in the community, and in most of the cases it constitutes an "unmarked choice" (see Myers-Scotton 1993) with respect to monolingual practices. Its value is mostly related to the community identity, as is noticeable from the fact that the term *llanito*, of a still uncertain etymology, is used to define both Gibraltar's inhabitants and their bilingual mixed code. Furthermore, *llanito* code switching occurs frequently also in satirical written texts and in local stage plays, as well as in unplanned written uses, for example in social networks.

2.2 Regular patterns in code switching

The main goal of the analysis was to detect the emergence of regular patterns in Gibraltar's bilingual speech, which could represent the structural features of an emerging mixed code, and instances of fusion in Auer's (2014) sense. Regular patterns are defined as emerging arbitrary constraints on language choice, with respect to some particular syntactic boundaries. In our case, such systematic regularities are found in the domain of extra-sentential switching, or tag-switching (Poplack 1980): the part of the clause expressing the propositional content of the utterance tends to be regularly expressed in English, whereas the extra clausal constituents, of which functional markers are a subset, are regularly expressed in Spanish; see (3):

(3) $[\text{CLAUSE}]_{eng}$ $[\text{ECC}]_{spa}$ $[\text{CLAUSE}]_{eng}$

Furthermore, as a sign of regularity and obligatoriness, no instances are found of an opposite pattern such as (4):

(4) $[\cancel{\text{CLAUSE}}]_{\cancel{spa}}$ $\cancel{[\text{ECC}]_{eng}}$ $\cancel{[\text{CLAUSE}]_{spa}}$

Switching of DMs, PMs and MPs must be thus seen against the background of a more general tendency involving also other elements of discourse grammar, and the rationale for this phenomenon lies probably in the class-specific features of 'utterance modifiers', 'extra-clausal constituents' or theticals.

We will address a qualitative evaluation of our data, providing several examples of how functional markers fit in the bilingual patterns described above. After Ghezzi (2014), we recognize three main groups of functions expressed by functional markers, namely: (1) social cohesion; (2) textual cohesion; and (3) personal stance. These three macro-domains include a wide range of functions each, and overlapping between categories is unavoidable; for this reason we will make reference in our analysis only to the generally accepted subgrouping of functional markers in: (1) discourse markers, (2) pragmatic markers, and (3) modal particles; see also Pons Bordería (2006). These three sets are looked at in a hierarchical way, so that extra-textual relations appear to be the most clause-external functions, textual relations are situated in the middle, and stance, which is related only to the proposition, is the most clause internal.[4]

Furthermore, particular attention has been given to the internal structure of the switched markers. Without adopting a specific position about the grammaticalization *vs* pragmaticalization debate (see Heine 2013 for an overview), we follow Kaltenböck *et al.* (2011) in adopting the distinction between *formulaic theticals*, ie. non compositional and morphologically unanalysable elements; *constructional theticals*, i.e. "recurrent patterns or constructions of theticals, being compositional but having some schematic structure and function" (Kaltenböck *et al.* 2011: 875); and *instantaneous*

[4] This hierarchical organization can be found with different labels in functional models accounting for a layered structure of the clause. See for example in Kroon (1995) the hallidayan distinction between 'interpersonal', 'presentational' and 'representational level'.

theticals, ie. totally compositional and not grammaticalized expressions which only in a particular discursive context acquire a discourse function, and work then as a DM, PM or MP. Examples can be found respectively in (5), (6) and (7):

(5) and i think it's a shame to lose the heritage and the culture of how we came *no*

(6) *te digo* it's interesting // *yo* i'm very passionate about it

'*I tell you* it's interesting // *me*, I'm very passionate about it'

(7) i don't have time at all // *no te lo digo pa' na'*

'I don't have time at all // *I don't tell it for nothing*'

In (5), the Spanish pragmatic marker *no* is a single lexical element, and belongs thus to formulaic theticals. In (6), the expression *te digo* clearly has a discourse-oriented function, in that it stresses the assertive modality of the following utterance (see below). However, its semantics is still partly compositional, and the marker cannot be treated as formally equivalent to fully grammaticalized expressions. At the same time, *te digo* constitutes a recurrent expression, which frequently occurs with the same functional value: for this reason, it is considered part of constructional theticals. In (7), the switched item is a comment clause that only in this particular setting acquires pragmatic value, it has fully compositional meaning and does not show any trace of grammaticalization: it is then regarded as an instantaneous thetical.

One of the goals of our analysis will then be to evaluate the relevance of these two factors, syntactic complexity and integration in the clause, in determining the presence of code switching patterns.

3 Pragmatic markers

Pragmatic markers are defined here a set of elements whose primary function is to manage the interaction between speaker and hearer. Here, we take into account two specific functions, namely, turn-management strategies in 3.1, and attention-getters in 3.2.

3.1 No: *turn yielding, agreement and something more*

The first bilingual pattern that is taken into account involves the Spanish PM *no.* As Moyer (2000) points out, this element can be used both for expressing a true 'yes-no' request, as in (8), and as a full-fledged PM, in order to request agreement from the addresse, as in (9):

(8) *porque* ehm my... Ethan's sister, she's bought one in phase... You're in phase two *no*

'*because* ehm my… Ethan's sister, she's bought one in phase... You're in phase two *aren't you*'

(Moyer 2000)

(9) *Sí sí*. I mean the thing is I got an opinion. I was talking in general *no*

'*Yes, yes*. I mean the thing is I got an opinion. I was talking in general *wasn't I*

(Moyer 2000)

However, its status in Gibraltar's bilingual speech seems to require some more attention. While categories such as 'yes-no request' and 'request of

agreement' clearly hold in a dialogical context, as soon as monological contexts are taken into account, new functions can be identified. In most of Moyer's examples, when *no* is used as a PM, it has the functions of a turn-giving device, used to elicit a reactive move of the addressee. On the contrary, in argumentative monologues such as the ones taken into account, *no* seems to work the other way around, as a floor-keeping strategy used to delimit argumentation *nuclei*, and possibly to signal the transition from one to the other. In this case, as shown in examples (10)-(12), no responsive move is expected from the addressee:

(10) with all the influences / *to' las cosa' que pasan* / and these people xxx // i wouldn't go anywhere else to live really *no*

'with all the influences / *all the things happening* / and these people xxx // i wouldn't go anywhere else to live really *would I*'

(11) the words that the older generation was using were passed down // *no* // and then now i think what 's happened now with the frontier opened // we're getting new llanito words

'the words that the older generation was using were passed down // *right* // and then now i think what 's happened now with the frontier opened // we're getting new llanito words '

(12) *no po'que yo* i could - i could tell that / more the spanish word was the llanito one word // cause i was so as aware of llanito for a very early age *no* // *y me enteresaba no*

'no because I, - i could tell that / more the spanish word was the llanito one word // cause i was so as aware of llanito for a very early age *wasn't I* // *and I used to like it, didn't I*

The uses shown above are probably to be understood in relation with what seems to be the English counterpart of *no*: question tags such as *isn't it, don't you*... For these items, Algeo (1998) accounts for both conversational and

monological/emphatic functions: tags can be used either as turn yelding devices, or in order to stress with various degrees the content of an utterance. Now, as in many varieties of world Englishes, question tags are absent in Gibraltarian English, and they have probably been replaced by *no*. This process is highly frequent in contact varieties, probably because it allows the substitution of "heavy" inflected forms with "lighter" uninflected structures. Looking at the data one could further assume that Spanish *no* has first replaced inflected tags in dialogic contexts, which are prototypical for Spanish. Only at a second stage the PM acquired through contact also the monological and argumentative functions described above.

3.2 Mira *as an attention getter*

Another instance of bilingual patterns involving PMs is the case of Spanish *mira*. Its function is mainly that of an attention-getting device, and it represents the outcome of a typical diachronic process through which perception verbs in many languages tend to develop a similar interactional function. Some examples are Italian *guarda*, English *look* and Spanish *oye* (see Fedriani *et al.* 2012). As for Spanish *mira*, the PM seems to have the same functions accounted for Italian *guarda* in Ghezzi & Molinelli (2014). In our corpus it occurs thus with three main functions: (a) at the utterance level, focussing on the process of enunciation, (b) at the propositional level, with

the function of calling for the attention of the addressee toward the propositional content of the utterance, and (c) as a marker of reported speech. All the three functions are found also in bilingual speech, as represented in examples (13)-(15):

(13) *si quiere'* i'll put it in *un* message // *y te pongo* a few names to see // *y mira* / *ya* obviously you manage your time *y* - // if i can be of any help or whatever

'if you want I'll put it in *a* message // *and I give you* a few names to see // *and look* / obviously you manage your time *and* - // if I can be of any help or whatever'

(14) those things are very alive *todavía aquí* // *pero* you won't hear younger people saying it // my generation is the marker // *y tiene su e'plicación* // because my generation was the last one // *mira* i grew up in an environment where we had three television stations

'those things are very alive *also here* // *but* you won't hear younger people saying it // my generation is the marker // *and it's got its own explanation* // because my generation was the last one // *look* i grew up in an environment where we had three television stations'

(15) i usually feature a list / media list or whatever // ah KR (he) is a contact in gibraltar // *mira* i need to find / a xxx place / to stay at an hotel or rent an accommodation

'i usually feature a list / media list or whatever // ah KR (he) is a contact in gibraltar // *look* i need to find / a xxx place / to stay at an hotel or rent an accommodation'

At a closer look, even though all the three functions are attested in our corpus, function (b) seems to prevail over the other two, and even the function of attention-getting seems to be often related to the introduction of a new discourse topic, as in examples (16)-(17):

(16) if you need anything let me know // *mira* // i told you i do support media // basically my role is a media fixer

(17) and luckily over the last decades / we 've had loads of people come over to do this stuff no // *y mira* // W is now doing that film

This outcome is partly unexpected, since the prototypical discursive functions of *mira* seem to be those related to the management of the interaction. We believe that this particular distribution could be due to the greater amount of monological or quasi-monological discourse as a possible bias. However, a contact-based explanation is still possible: the predominance of textual and informational functions over the interactional ones could be possibly seen as a sign that the effects of language contact reach deeper levels of sentence structure in comparison with other situations where interactional functions are the only ones exposed to language contact (see Fiorentini, this volume). This view seems to be confirmed if one considers that in Gibraltar's code switching the PMs occurring in regular patterns are especially the ones having a closer bound with the clause, such as *mira* and *no* above. On the other hand, less integrated PMs, which are characterized by an autonomous illocution and can constitute the sole member of a turn unit, do not show the same regularities, and, on the contrary, can be switched in both directions:

(18) excuse me // sorry excuse me // sorry // *cuando pueda no' pone otro café grande / un café con leche / y un té* please // thank_you

'excuse me // sorry excuse me // sorry // *at your convenience can you bring us one more big coffee /coffee with milk / and a tea* please // thank you '

The sentence quoted in (18) belongs to the same corpus as the preceding ones, but seems to be organized according to a totally different principle: all the formulae of social exchange are in English whereas the core proposition is in Spanish. This means that not all members of the PMs class participate in the

patterns described above. As will be argued in the final discussion, the reason for this discrepancy could be that items such as *sorry* and *thank_you* are closer to autonomous speech acts and follow thus the principles of intersentential code switching, which does not seem to be constrained by the same patterns as language mixing.

4 Textual relations

The first instance of switching of DMs in the Gibraltar corpus is represented by the Spanish reported speech marker *dice*, arisen from the 3rd person singular of the verb "say". The high frequency of *dice*, as well as its reportative value, are clear from example (19). The quoted passage corresponds to a short section of a monologue, in which the speaker is telling a joke. Several reported speech moves are present, and almost each of these is introduced by *dice*, regardless of the language of the following utterance. Furthermore, *dice* seems to have a part also in signaling a change of speaker in reported speech.

(19) gonna tell you a story about this chap // who tells his friend *mira que: tengo un trabajo* // and i've got to be away from gibraltar for many months // cause i have to travel *por e'paña y to' eso* // ***dice*** // and i got two things / which are the ones i love most // *mi madre y el gato* // *dice* but would you mind taking care of them // ***dice*** *que bueno esta bien* // i'll take care of them ***dice*** i'll phone you now and again // *y tu me dice como está mi madre y el gato* // so / *passo un mé* // and after the month is over / *llama el* // ***dice*** *qué como está mi madre y el gato* // ***dice*** *oh tu madre 'sta bien* / *pero 'l gato se subió a un arbol* / *y saltó* / *y lo cogió un coche y lo mató* // *HOMBRE* // why do you tell me suddenly // tell me *a poquito a poco* / so that the shock is not so big // *bueno* ok // so you should have said // call me one day say *mira que* the cat got up a tree // ok // three days later you call me you say // *mira que el gato saltó del*

arbol y se la'timo // and then you say // *mira* well he ran // a car got him and killed him xxx // ok ok // so / two months later he calls his friend // ***dice*** *qué* how are things // ***dice*** look // your mother got up a tree

'gonna tell you a story about this chap // who tells his friend *look*: *I have a job* // and i've got to be away from gibraltar for many months // cause i have to travel *across Spain and stuff* // *he_says* // and i got two things / which are the ones i love most // *my mother and the cat* //*he_says* but would you mind taking care of them // *he_says good it's OK* // i'll take care of them *he_says* i'll phone you now and again // *and you tell me how my mother and the cat are* // so / *a month passed*// and after the month is over / *he calls* // *he_says how are my mother and the cat* // *he_ says* oh *your mother is fine* / *but the cat climbed up a tree* /*and jumped* / *and a car got it and killed it*// *MAN*// why do you tell me suddenly // tell me *little by little* / so that the shock is not so big // *well* ok // so you should have said // call me one day say *look* the cat got up a tree // ok // three days later you call me you say // *look the cat jumped from the tree and hurt himself* // and then you say // *look* well he ran // a car got him and killed him xxx // ok ok // so / two months later he calls his friend // *he_says* how are things // *he_says* look // your mother got up a tree'

Other instances of bilingual patterns involving DMs are found in self-corrections and repair moves introduced by *bueno*, as in (20) and (21), and with textual connectives such as *conque*, as in (22) and (23):

(20) and then after that so like everybody goes away and then so like people go out // they go to eat i:n different places or / things are organised // then there's like a: - *bueno* the day before - *bueno* this year there was a - // they had a: show

'… *well* the day before – *well* this year…'

(21) after a while *te ha toma'o un par de* drinks // and now you're getting a bit more happier *no* // and if you are here they say something to you / and then all the stuff // and there's a big brawl without necessity really // so you just / xxx *tu te queda' aquí* and / it's mo:re more peaceful // *bueno* if you want to be there

'after a while *you had a couple of drinks* … // so you just / xxx *you stay here* and / it's more more peaceful // *well* if you want to be there'

(22) i enjoy it // that's why i made the website *conque* (1.5) it's a shame / you're right about the young children

'… *so* it's a shame'

(23) look at the things around us // we have morocco we have spain // *conque* we're just a rebound of big countries

'*so* we're just a rebound of big countries'

A qualitative analysis of the use of these DMs shows no great differences in function between monolingual and bilingual speech, so that it is not possible to assume the presence of particular patterns of language change regarding these items, as observed for example in the case of *no.* We argue however that even without contact-induced change, the striking aspect of bilingual speech in Gibraltar is its regularity and orderliness: all the extra-clausal elements, regardless of their function, are switched from Spanish, and the core utterance is expressed in English, and never the other way round. We believe therefore that mixed codes are more saliently characterized by systematic effects related to a whole class of elements rather than by semantic change or functional expansion of single forms. Furthermore, as far as code switching is concerned, it can be observed that discourse functions such as quotation and conclusion, normally expressed by DMs, in many bilingual situations trigger intersentential code switching. In a conversation, for example, reported speech moves may be signaled by a momentary change in the language of interaction (see Auer 1995) which is coextensive with the reported passage. This also occurs in sentence (19), in passages like *dice que bueno está bien*, where the entire reported speech passage is switched. We can conclude thus that, as Auer (1999) points out, intersentential code switching has to be seen as diachronically previous to the patterns stressed above; on the other hand, bilingual patterns involving DMs could constitute

frozen forms arising out of conversational code switching and devoided of their original pragmatic function.

4.1 Beyond discourse markers

All the examples discussed so far involved morphosyntactically simple and unanalyzable functional markers, which have completed their process of grammaticalization, or pragmaticalization. However, in our study we regard as a sign of deeper fusion between the two systems in contact the possibility of extending the same bilingual pattern also to more complex and less grammaticalized constructions. A specific pragmatic function can thus be expressed by DMs proper, ie. items fully integrated into the lexicon, and corresponding to Heine's formulaic theticals, as well as by more complex items, which are characterized by a lower degree of grammaticalization in the case of constructional theticals, or by no grammaticalization at all, in the case of spontaneous theticals. Now, one of the main outcomes of this research was to find out that not only bilingual patterns apply to DMs proper, but also to more complex structures which share the same functional domain of textual relations.

In the Gibraltar corpus, the same regularities highlighted for discourse markers apply also to other elements which will be called 'complex connectives', due to their greater syntactic complexity; in thetical grammar,

they are regarded as being part of constructional theticals (see above). Let us consider for instance the case of Spanish *é_que*, a substandard realization of *es_que,* which in some accounts has a textual function. This DM is mainly used to introduce a new content into the discourse, and at the same time to qualify it as an explanation, or a justification. Some instances of this connective are found also in Gibraltar corpus. In (24) and (25) we quote two examples of justifications introduced by the marker *é_que*, which clearly pattern in the same way as their non-constructional counterparts discussed above:

(24) M: cause i do business *no* // maybe: - // *no se* // *suiza*

'cause I do business // maybe: - // *I don't know* // Switzerland'

E: *suiza*? there was also a guy yesterday who told me switzerland // *por qué*

'*Switzerland*? … *why*?'

M: switzerland // *é_que* switzerland is known for business // *y lo bien que xxx lo'banco y eso*

'Switzerland // *it is that* Switzerland is known for business // *and the good that* xxx *banks and stuff*'

(25) GM: *yo de mi* year *que yo sepa no hay tanto como –*

'*I, from my* year *to my knowledge there are not as much as* -'

AG: *é_que* from my year / she's a year older than me / everyone does cocaine

'*it's that* from my year…'

The data show that, even though a marker like *é_que* is apparently more complex, less grammaticalized, bimorphemic and partly compositional, it is

treated as a single lexical unit in bilingual speech, and probably reflects an ongoing process of grammaticalization, at least in some varieties of Spanish.

A clearer example of bilingual patterns extended to complex constructions is the case of a subset of pseudo-cleft sentences involving a rhematic subordinate clause as the argument of the copula (see Collins 1991, Berretta 2002 for Italian).

(26) *lo que pasa é que* the food is very similar to what - it's little / things

'*what happens is that* the food is very similar to what - it's little / things'

(27) *lo que pasó era que* they started the youth as a normal thing

'*what happenend was that* they started the youth as a normal thing*'*

(28) *la gracia y la suerte que tenemo é que* llanito is funy in itself

''the gift and the luck that we have is that llanito is funny in itself

(29) *lo malo é que* the ones sending these orders *en plan* / *que no*- they are not affected *por eso*

'*the bad thing is that* the ones sending these orders *like* / *that* - they are not affected *by this*'

In sentences like (26)-(29) it can be observed that the same bilingual pattern highlighted above applies to this type of pseudo-cleft sentences. The point is that here switching is not related to a specific lexical element, but rather to the structural position where the theme occurs, as opposed to the rheme expressed in the following English clause. Since the same behaviour is also shown by other constructions with information-structural functions, such as for example Themes[5] and left dislocations (Goria, forth.), it can be argued

[5] We use the expression 'Theme', with a capital letter, in Dik's (1997) sense, that is to say as a type of extra-clausal constituen occurring at the left periphery, and opposed to Tail,

that what allows for the same treatment in bilingual speech of DMs and entities of greater complexity is precisely the discourse organization function shared by all these constructions.

5 Modality and illocution

The third domain on which we have focused is that of modality, in which MPs are concerned. In particular, we have considered two main types of partially related particles. The first set includes MPs proper, which are intended as those elements that express the speaker's personal stance and commitment toward the propositional content of the utterance, and in particular to its illocutionary force. This category is best represented in our view by markers of stressing and hedging. The second set includes then a number of particles which are themselves markers of illocutionary force. As said, the two have been considered at the same macro-level as modal particles because, in opposition to PMs and DMs, they happen to have scope only on the single utterance.

---

occurring at the right periphery. On the contrary, 'theme' in lower-case is intended here as an information-related notion indicating the information on which the clause is built, and which is developed by the rheme (see Halliday 1970; Collins 1991: Ch. 5).

5.1 Modality

The Spanish MP *digo*, alongside with other textual functions, is generally used in our corpus as a device to emphasize an assertive illocution, especially in the case where a speaker is expressing a personal evaluation on a given topic.

(30) KR: yeah it's good

(4.2)

EG: and with a character who is also known to the community

KR: very well-know very loved // *y te digo* i_mean he knows it / he knows his stuff

'very well-know very loved // *and I tell you*, I mean he knows it / he knows his stuff'

(31) but this is / we do it all the time // *por eso te digo* just feel free // i told you (this time)

'but this is / we do it all the time // *that's why I tell you* just feel free // i told you (this time)'

(32) *te digo* it's interesting // *yo* i'm very passionate about it

'*I tell you* it's interesting // *me* I'm very passionate about it'

(33) we have / *te_digo* / *el mi'mo interé no* // in the language // *pero te digo* my hats off to him

'we have *I tell you* / *the same interest no* // in the language // *but I tell you* my hats off to him'

As observed before with respect to DMs, *digo*, as well as its more complex equivalents such as *te_digo* in the examples above, can be seen as partially frozen forms resulting out of a diachronic path. This case seems to be particularly interesting since there is evidence of bilingual patterns involving

different types of entities related to the same function: fully grammaticalized MPs (*digo*), partly grammaticalized constructional theticals (*te digo*, *yo te digo*, …) and also spontaneous theticals. This last case is best represented in our view by explicit performatives, as in (34):

(34) you cannot park here // *te digo por qué* // i need the entrance clear in two hours

'you cannot park here // *I tell you why* // i need the entrance clear in two hours'

5.2 Markers of illocution

Particles expressing the illocutionary force of an utterance are considered here as the ones with the highest degree of integration in the clause. They have scope only on the proposition and their function lies somewhat halfway between a pragmatic function, namely that of expressing the speakers' stance, and a grammatical one, for example the expression of interrogatives. In our data, several bilingual clauses are found containing the Spanish MP *qué,* which precisely has the function of expressing interrogative illocution, as in

(35) he calls his friend *dice* // *qué* how are things?

'he calls is friend, *he says:* (*INT*) how are things?'

(36) *qué* what's this thing?

'(*INT*) how are things?'

In this case, it can be noted that the presence of *qué* is optional, since the interrogative illocution is already expressed by the VS word order requested in the English clause. For such sentences, thus, the use of *qué* could be more

probably interpreted as a pragmatic strategy to stress an already expressed illocution. In partial contrast, non-polar questions do not trigger VS inversion, and *qué* happens to be the only lexical marker of interrogative illocution, as in (37)-(38):

(37) *qué* you liked the story?

'*INT* did you like the story?'

(38) *qué* you're funding your own research?

'*INT* are you funding your own research?'

6 Discussion and conclusions

The analysis of PMs, DMs and MPs in our corpus allows us to come to a number of conclusions. First, new data have been provided, which confirm the view of Maschler (1994, 1998) and Muysken (2007), who both regard functional markers as one of the elements that can give rise to a mixed code. We can therefore argue that bilingual speech in Gibraltar is characterized by incipient fusion in Auer's (1999, 2014) sense. Its salient feature is therefore the fact that functional markers are consistently involved in almost fixed switching patterns, in which the direction of the switch is constrained. The functional motivation of this constraint can be seen in Maschler's terms as the separation between processes of *languaging* and *metalanguaging*, or, in Heine's (2013) terms, as a separation between sentence grammar, which tends here to be English-based, and thetical grammar, which tends to be Spanish-based (see also Heine, forthcoming). Furthermore, making reference to more general

models of discourse grammar has proven fruitful in at least two ways. First, it has allowed to find similarities in bilingual speech between functional markers and other discourse-relevant entities such as pseudo-clefts. Secondly, the distinction between formulaic, constructional and instantaneous theticals has proven useful in that it allows to treat in the same way markers of different syntactic complexity and with different degrees of pragmaticalization.

Turning now to more specific issues, it is often argued that the more a linguistic item is relevant at the discourse level, the more it will be exposed to language contact (see Matras 1998 *inter al.*). As for the subdivision adopted here, a sort of implication could be found, whereby PMs are the most switchable entities, followed by DMs and then by MPs.

(39) PMs > DMs > MPs

While this seems to generally hold true in many situations, and could be possibly confirmed about Gibraltar's bilingual speech through a quantitative analysis, which is still a *desideratum*, other different trends must not be overlooked. If the whole dimension of bilingual speech is taken into account, and not functional markers alone, an exception to (39) is represented by the least syntactically integrated PMs, which can constitute the only members of a conversational turn. Such items have shown a more unstable behaviour in bilingual speech, since they admit switching in both directions, in opposition with more clause-internal markers, which regularly occur only in Spanish. This is easily explainable in terms of different switching patterns: the least

integrated elements appear thus to have more similarities with intersentential code switching, to which the patterns described here do not apply.

Finally, it is argued here that the functional and pragmatic motivations involved in the formation of the regular patterns described so far are complementary to sociolinguistic explanations, which will only be touched on in these conclusions. While borrowing hierarchies and discourse grammar accounts can provide an internal rationale for the emergence of regular bilingual patterns, external motivations too need to be taken into account. The massive use of Spanish functional markers, along with other discourse-relevant constructions, was considered here "globally meaningful" in Auer's (1999) sense: bilingual patterns involving Spanish markers do no longer express a local pragmatic function, since all the possible monolingual alternatives are being eliminated. On the contrary, bilingual patterns can be seen as diagnostic features of an emerging English-based mixed code: motivations for this more general process are to be looked for in the socio-historical features of Gibraltar as a contact scenery, and more precisely in the currently ongoing process of language shift.

References

Algeo, John. 1988. The Tag Question in British English: It's Different, I'n't?. *English World Wide* 9:171–91.

Álvarez Cáccamo, Celso. 1998. From switching code to code-switching. Towards a reconceptualization of communicative codes. In *Code-switching in Conversation. Language, Interaction and Identity,* Peter Auer (ed). London, Routledge.

Auer, Peter. 1995. The Pragmatics of Code-switching: A Sequential Approach. In *One Speaker, Two Languages*, Lesley Milroy & Pieter Muysken (eds), 115-135. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Auer, Peter (ed.). 1998. *Code-switching in Conversation*. *Language, Interaction and Identity.* London: Routledge.

Auer, Peter. 1999. From codeswitching via language mixing to fused lects. Toward a dynamic typology of bilingual speech. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 3: 309-332.

Auer, Peter. 2014. Language mixing and language fusion: when bilingual talk becomes monolingual. In *Congruence in Contact-Induced Language Change*, Juliane Besters-Dilger, Cynthia Dermarkar, Stefan Pfänder & Achim Rabus (eds), 294-336. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Berretta, Monica. 2002. Quello che voglio dire che: le scisse da strutture topicalizzanti a connettivi testuali. In *La parola al testo. Scritti per Bice Mortara Garavelli*, Gian Luigi Beccaria & Carla Marello (eds), 15-31. Alessandria: Dell'Orso.

Berruto, Gaetano. 1987. Lingua, dialetto, diglossia, dilalia. In *Romania et Slavia adriatica. Festschrift für Žarko Muljačić,* Gunther Holtus & Johannes Kramer (eds), 57-92. Hamburg: Buske Verlag.

Berruto, Gaetano. 1995. *Fondamenti di sociolinguistica*. Bari: Laterza.

Bybee, Joan & Fleischmann, Suzanne. 1995. *Modality in Grammar and Discourse*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Collins, Peter C. 1991. *Cleft and Pseudo-cleft constructions in English*. London: Routledge.

Dik, Simon. 1997. *The Theory of Functional Grammar. Vol 2: Complex and derived constructions*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Fedriani, Chiara, Ghezzi Chiara & Van Olmen, Daniël. 2012. Imperatives of perception verbs as attention-getting devices: a typological study. Paper presented at the 45th annual meeting of SLE. Stockholm, August.

Ghezzi, Chiara & Molinelli Piera (eds). 2014. *Discourse and pragmatic markers from Latin to the Romance languages* [Oxford Studies in Diachronic and Historical Linguistics]. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ghezzi, Chiara. 2014. The development of discourse and pragmatic markers. In *Discourse and pragmatic markers from Latin to the Romance languages*, Chiara Ghezzi & Piera Molinelli, 10-28. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Goria, Eugenio. 2015. *Il discorso bilingue a Gibilterra. L'emergere di schemi regolari nella commutazione di codice.* PhD dissertation, Università di Pavia.

Goria, Eugenio. forthcoming. The role of extra-clausal constituents in code-switching. Regular patterns in a bilingual corpus. In *Outside the clause: Form and Function of extra-clausal constituents,* Gunther Kaltenböck, Evelien Keizer & Arne Lohmann (eds), Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Gumperz, John. 1964. Hindi-Punjabi Code-Switching in Delhi. In: *Proceedings of the Ninth International Congress of Linguistics* Horace J. Lunt (ed.), 1115-1124. The Hague: Mouton

Gumperz, John. 1982. *Discourse Strategies.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Halliday, Michael A. K. 1970. Language structure and language function. In *New Horizons in Linguistics*, John Lyons (ed), 140-165. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Heine, Bernd. 2013. On discourse markers. Grammaticalization, Pragmaticalization or something else? *Linguistics* 51(6): 1205-1247.

Heine, Bernd. forthcoming. Extra-clausal constituents, theticals, and language contact. In *Outside the clause: Form and Function of extra-clausal constituents,* Gunther Kaltenböck, Evelien Keizer & Arne Lohmann (eds), Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Kaltenböck, Gunther, Heine, Bernd & Kuteva, Tania. 2011. On thetical grammar. *Studies in language* 35: 852-897.

Kaltenböck, Gunther, Evelien Keizer & Arne Lohmann (eds). forthcoming. *Outside the Clause: Form and Function of extra-clausal constituents.* [Studies in Language Companion Series 178], Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Kellerman, Anja. 2001. *A New New English. Language, Politics and Identity in Gibraltar*. Heidelberg: Heidelberg Schriften zur Sprache und Kultur.

Kramer, Johannes. 1986. *English and Spanish in Gibraltar*. Hamburg: Buske Verlag.

Kramer, Johannes. 1998. Die Sprache Gibraltars. In *Lexikon der Romanistischen Linguistik. Band VII*, Günter Holtus, Michael Metzeltin & Christian Schmitt (eds), 310-316. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Kroon, Caroline. 1995. *Discourse particles in Latin: a study of nam, enim, autem, vero, and at*. Amsterdam: Gieben.

Levey, David. 2008a. The changing face of Gibraltarian English. Th-fronting on the Rock. In *Issues in accents of English,* Ewa Waniek-Klimczak (ed), 91-102. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholar Press.

Levey, David. 2008b. *Language change and variation in Gibraltar*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Lipski, John. 1986. Sobre el bilingüismo anglo-hispánico en Gibraltar. *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 87(3): 414–427.

Maschler, Yael 1994. Metalanguaging and discourse markers in bilingual conversation. *Language in Society* 23:3, 325-366.

Maschler, Yael. 1998. On the transition from code-switching to a mixed code. In *Code-Switching in Conversation*, Peter Auer (ed), 125-149. London: Routledge.

Matras, Yaron. 1998. Utterance modifiers and universals of grammatical borrowing. *Linguistics* 36(2): 281-331.

Molinelli, Piera. 2014. Orientarsi nel discorso: segnali discorsivi e segnali pragmatici in italiano. In *Discorso e cultura nella lingua e nella letteratura italiana*, Elena Pîrvu (ed), 195-208. Firenze: Franco Cesati.

Moyer, Melissa. 1998. Bilingual conversation strategies in Gibraltar. In *Codeswitching in conversation*, Peter Auer (ed), 215-236. London: Routledge.

Moyer, Melissa. 2000. Negotiating agreement and disagreement in Spanish-English bilingual conversations with no. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 4 (4): 485-504.

Muysken, Pieter. 2007. Mixed codes. In *Handbook of Multilingualism and Multilingual Communication*, Peter Auer & Li Wei (eds.), 315-339. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter.

Muysken, Pieter. 2013. Language contact outcomes as the result of bilingual optimization strategies. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 16(4): 1-22.

Myers-Scotton, Carol. 1993. *Duelling Languages. Grammatical Structure in Codeswitching*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Oesch-Serra, Cecilia. 1998. Discourse connectives in bilingual conversation: the case of an emerging French-Italian mixed code. In *Code switching in conversation. Language, interaction, identity*, Peter Auer (ed), 101-124. London: Routledge.

Pons Bordería, Salvador. 2006. A functional approach for the study of discourse markers. In *Approaches to discourse particles,* Kerstin Fischer (ed), 77-99. Oxford: Elsevier.

Poplack, Shana. 1980. Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish *y termino en español*. Toward a typology of code-switching. *Linguistics* 18(7/8): 581-618.

Traugott, Elizabeth Closs 2010. Revisiting subjectification and intersubjectification. In *Subjectification, Intersubjectification and Grammaticalization*, Kristin Davidse, Lieven Vandelanotte, & Hubert Cuyckens (eds.), 29-70. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.