

Multilingual repertoires and the consequences for linguistic theory¹

Georges Lüdi

Introduction

In cultural studies, the idea of monolithic ‘Cultures’ was replaced long ago by a more dynamic and constructivist. Cultures are thus conceived as sets of norms and behaviours that are constructed and deconstructed in interaction with relevant others. In modern societies, this happens in the compass of open social networks; each individual participates in several groups, assimilates norms, behaviours and values of different origins and combines them forming a more or less coherent whole. It is, however, sometimes difficult to make these processes manifest inside a society (see Werlen et al. 1992 for an interesting example of cultural differences among speakers of the same dialect in a district of Berne). In interaction between members of more distant cultures, the same types of processes become more visible; the resulting ‘interculture’ is quantitatively, but not qualitatively different from normal everyday culture in modern societies. The impact which the analysis of the socio-cognitive dynamics of intercultural communication has on cultural theory thus

matches the possible impact of socio-cognitive aspects of bi- and multilingualism on language theory.

We will argue that the reverse is also true. There may be instances of intercultural communication without the use of any natural language or among monolingual speakers of the same language. In most cases, however, intercultural communication takes place between speakers of different languages, either in direct interaction or with the help of mediators (interpreters, translators). In either case, multilingual competences are presupposed. They are considered here as linguistic resources available to members of a community for socially significant interactions. The totality of these resources constitutes the linguistic repertoire of a person or a community and may include different languages, dialects, registers, styles and routines spoken. The interactionist interpretation of repertoire underlying this chapter is grounded on a contextualised and collective conception of activities and of human cognition, and focuses on the central role that practical communication (and, therefore, social action) play in their formatting. According to this concept, multilingual repertoires are configured in the course of practical activities that are linked with specific sociocultural contexts and with particular forms of action, interaction and intersubjectivity. This leads to various forms of multilingual speech as a response of precise, locally situated communicative needs. We will argue that the analysis of formal manifestations of multilingual repertoires contributes to a better understanding of intercultural communication. But the reverse is true also. The careful analysis of different manifestations of multilingual repertoires, situated in specific intercultural contexts and negotiated between interlocutors, questions a number of established representations of what

a 'language' is. Thus, the investigation of the use of multilingual repertoires in the dynamics of intercultural communication may contribute to a more appropriate theory of language and of language use.

A major concern in this respect refers to representations of multilingualism, its normality and the values assigned to it. In 1890, a famous professor from the University of Cambridge could still affirm: "If it were possible for a child to live in two languages at once equally well, so much the worse. His intellectual and spiritual growth would not thereby be doubled, but halved. Unity of mind and character would have great difficulty in asserting itself in such circumstances." (Laurie 1890, 15). Today, he would seem ridiculous with such a statement. Since the early eighties, specialists agree on a 'holistic' view of bi- or multilingual competence and of bi- or multilingual persons respectively. The 'additive' conception of independent monolingual competences has been replaced by the idea of an integrated bi- or multilingual or polylectal competence (Lüdi and Py 1984, ³2003, Grosjean 1985, Titone 1987, Siguan 1987 etc.).

Of course, multilingualism does not concern linguistic competence alone. It normally entails life in two or more cultures. This does not mean a ideal, coordinated, unrestricted membership of several cultural communities. In the following, we will define multilingualism functionally — in the sense that a multilingual individual is able to adapt his or her language choice to the situation and to switch from one language to the other, if necessary, independently from the balance between his or her competences. Similarly, we define pluriculturalism as the capacity of crossing borders between cultures, of sharing, more or less completely, several perspectives on the world. Thus, multilingualism entails

breaking up the prison of a single culture, putting the concepts and values of each distinct cultural system in relative terms, bridging cultures and integrating them into a proper metasystem. The resulting social identity can be harmonious or characterised by breaks and contradictions, but is in any case plural. Becoming multilingual thus entails, in most cases, the development of an intercultural communicative competence. We would like to argue that the translinguistic markers that will be analysed in the following article may be viewed as its emblematic expression (see Lüdi and Py et al. 1994 and Lüdi and Py ³2003 for more details).

The actual state of research on multilingualism is characterised by a large number of publications on numerous situations of languages in contact. One central domain of work is the ways in which social groups deal and ‘manage’ with multilingual repertoires. Increasing professional and private mobility is indeed generating multiple forms of intertwining of language groups. Rapid political and economic changes affect the status and the use of less frequently spoken languages. Social multilingualism is increasingly coming to be considered normal. This is also reflected in the topics of research. Special attention has been paid to macrosociolinguistic aspects of diglossia and polyglossia — including the ways political and educational measures influence the social functions of the languages in contact. Traces of multilingualism at the surface of discourse constitute a second important area of research. The European Science Foundation acknowledged the importance of this theme by the creation of a ‘scientific network’ (Milroy and Muysken 1995).

This chapter stands in the tradition last mentioned. It deals mainly with “translinguistic markers“ (Lüdi 1987, Auer 1990). These are forms at the surface of

discourse like loans, interferences, code-switching etc., which seem to result from an influence exerted by a language/variety A on a language/variety B or which seem to represent a mixture of both. Recent research proposes different competing systems for classifying translinguistic markers. Given the variety of criteria, the same observations may well be very differently interpreted according to different theoretical models.

The objective of this chapter, however, is not to describe these phenomena. The ‘quaestio’ underlying our reflections is rather whether this type of investigation is of marginal interest for linguistics and diverts from the ‘core business’, or whether the results of research on multilingual repertoires and translinguistic markers are of immediate relevance for linguistic theory and for a better understanding of intercultural communication. In respect of the above mentioned shift in paradigm, this question is of major importance. The phenomenon of multilingualism and particularly of translinguistic markers are not haunted any more by an antiquated monolingual ideology, but rather respected as a sign of a rich multilingual personality. In this conception, linguistic and cultural identity is not necessarily indivisible and translinguistic markers announce a self confident plural — multicultural and multilingual — identity. A good example of this phenomenon is given by the numerous forms of functions of ‘language mixing’ in modern literature (Riatsch 1994, Franceschini 1995, Lüdi 1998b, Grutman 1997, Lüdi 2001 etc.). But if multilingualism is considered normal, shouldn’t this influence the ways linguists build their models of language and language behaviour? We argue, in other words, that the main linguistic models must be evaluated on their capacity to explain multilingual competence and its traces appropriately. Multilingualism studies could then be prototypical

for linguistic research as certain phenomena are more perceptible in contact situations (the ‘magnifying-glass effect’).

Given that intercultural communication is more than just the exchange of information across cultural borders, but entails cultural changes and phenomena of hybridisation — and adopting an interactionist conception of speech as mentioned before —, one may argue that the detailed analysis of language use by multilinguals will bring a major contribution to the understanding of the dynamics of intercultural communication.

The following issues will be discussed:

First, we will deal with the question of how general linguistic theory could be influenced by a functional grammar of code-switching.

In the second part the attitudes towards translinguistic markers will be outlined. We shall identify ambiguities in respect to the problem of their emblematic or stigmatising status because of confusion between ‘exolingual’ and bilingual phenomena. We shall argue that formal linguistic criteria alone are not sufficient to classify translinguistic markers. Their characterisation must rather take into account the negotiation between the partners involved in the interaction and must be interpreted according to the methodology of conversational analysis.

We will argue that forms of multilingual speech manifest — and contribute to the construction of — plural identities in intercultural communication.

We will conclude with a discussion of how investigation of translinguistic markers might actually question the traditional meaning of the term ‘language’.

Translinguistic markers are not abnormalities but rule-governed phenomena

Rule-governed language choice

How does a bilingual person make an appropriate choice from among the varieties that constitute his/her repertoire? There is consensus among specialists that this choice is not arbitrary but governed by rules (Grosjean 1982, 145).

Macrosociolinguistic research established the existence of domains appropriate for the use of one or the other language in diglossic societies (Fishman 1967). Bilinguals would thus choose the appropriate variety taking into account whether it is a private or public affair, whether the conversation concerns the professional world or leisure activities, religion or education, etc. Where domains entwine (e.g. when an adolescent speaks with a minister [religion] about football [leisure] in the school building [education]), individual factors are isolated and pondered over. Language choice would be determined by characteristic bundles of situational factors (Grosjean 1982, 135ff). The same applies to heterogeneous diglossic societies. In all these cases, the value of each language is thoroughly appreciated. By choosing one or the other variety of his/her repertoire, the bilingual speaker makes the most rewarding use of his communicative resources.

On the other hand, one important result of microsociolinguistic investigation has been to show that the 'situation' is not simply given in advance, but constructed by the partners in the interaction itself by a common effort of interpretation and definition. In

other words, language choice is not the outcome of a mechanistic calculation of situational factors, but, on the contrary, a significant tool at the disposal of interlocutors for defining the situation in a way that suits their intentions. The room for action is of course variable. Interlocutors will mostly choose the same language when there is strong social determination or when there is only one common language. Stable language choice may also result from personal habits or from automatisms (i.e. when a particular perceptive scheme entails an unconscious language choice). But in many situations there are no clear rules or habits and the interlocutors must make an active, creative choice (Lüdi 1986). The exploitation of this free game in the ‘grammar’ of language choice as well as the conscious break of social rules (e.g. when a bilingual intentionally chooses a language her interlocutor does not speak) are socially meaningful (Gumperz 1982, Myers Scotton 1993a).

Mixing is rule-governed too

Sometimes the choice of the appropriate language is not evident. Bilinguals can choose between a monolingual mode and a bilingual mode (Grosjean 1985), i.e. between monolingual and bilingual speech (Lüdi and Py 1984, ³2003) respectively. In the first case, the language that is not used is ‘switched off’ as far as possible. In the second case, the speaker’s whole repertoire is activated. Possible criteria for the choice of the monolingual or bilingual mode are: the interlocutors’ repertoire, the degree of formality of the situation, normative representations of the interlocutors, etc. In other words, the situation is not ‘automatically’ bilingual even if both interlocutors are similarly bilingual. Bilingual mode

requires a — locally established — mutual agreement on its appropriateness. This holds true for balanced as well as for unbalanced bilingualism (e.g. in the case of learners).

In bilingual mode, the choice of the basis, or matrix, language is less stable and translinguistic markers appear with a much higher frequency. The use of translinguistic markers, particularly the mechanisms of borrowing and code-switching, has been shown to be rule-governed by numerous investigations. In their groundbreaking work, Sankoff and Poplack (e.g. 1979) established the bases of a “grammar of code-switching”. It has been completed (and partially contradicted) by more recent publications (cf. Romaine 1989, 110ff. for an overview and Myers Scotton 1993b). As for the — sociolinguistic and pragmatic — “functions of code-switching”, seminal papers by Gumperz (1967, 1982) and others have been taken up and integrated into more sophisticated systems, among others by Auer (1984), Heller (1988), Gardner-Chloros (1991) and Myers Scotton (1993a).

The following sentence was uttered by a Spanish migrant in Neuchâtel, situated in the French-speaking part of Switzerland (cf. Lüdi and Py 1984, ³2003 for full details):

- (1) *Vamos a la gare.*
Let's go to the railway-station.

The matrix language Spanish provides the syntactical frame and all the grammatical morphemes. The code-switching to the French “gare” is possible because the French lemma fits into the open slot offered by the Spanish grammar. Its function is ‘deictic’. By using the French word instead of the Spanish “estación”, the speaker indicates that she is referring not to the corresponding Spanish institution, but to the Swiss railway station of Neuchâtel

with all its specific functions for the migrant community (meeting place, starting point for a return to the country of origin, etc.).

The next example comes from a German speaking apprentice (=E) with only approximate French skills. He participates in an apprentice exchange, currently lives in the French part of the country and explains his usual work place to a French speaking instructor (=V). Many lexical morphemes are German, however the matrix language French even provides the construction plan for word composition (object + *de* + material) and the (inaudible) plural mark for *mast*. One also notices the problem caused by the differences in the gender systems: two genders in French, three genders in German, often with non matching genders of corresponding words (see Lüdi 1997 for an initial discussion of this example):

- (2) E: *et il y a un petit moteur (...) qui tire le cocon il y a la vorrichtung il y a de grands mast de stahl*
and there is a little motor (...) that pulls the cocoon and there is the device [n. fem.] there are tall masts [n. masc] of steel
- V: oui donc/
yes then/
- E: avec de des . . . bottes *oder eine Schiene*
with [partitive article] ... boots or a rail
- V: un rail
a rail
- E: un rail et le cocon a une petite roulette
a rail and the cocoon has a little reel
- V: oui
yes
- E: et la roulette est dans la rail
and the reel is in the rail
- V: oui donc ça bouge comme ça
yes so it moves like that
- E: oui oui . et la la *Gestell*>
yes yes . and the the support [n. neutr.]
- V: oui
yes
- E: où est le la rail est
where the [art. masc.] the [art. fem.] rail is
- V: fixé>
fixed
- E: fixé oui c'est la *Aufhängungsvorrichtung*

fixed yes that is the suspending device [n. fem.]
V: ah d'accord
ah okay

(corpus Victor Saudan)

Systematic observations of examples like this have led to the hypothesis that there are rules and norms that overlap single languages and govern the harmonic, i.e. the 'grammatical', mixing of elements from different languages. It may be assumed that the matrix language chosen for various reasons (level of competence of the speaker, presumed level of competence of the audience, conformity with the situation) is activated and provides the cognitive scaffolding for the semiotic organisation of a representation (Talmy 1985, 1995). Searching for the appropriate words for what he wants to say, the speaker then scans both of his lexica (or both subsets of his global bilingual lexicon). To fill the gap of words he does not know, that are momentarily not accessible or that may not even exist in the matrix language — or to achieve a special discourse effect —, he will switch to the embedded language. But this is only possible if the lemma of the embedded language word matches the slot provided by the matrix language. If this is not the case, the speaker will choose to switch to the embedded language for a larger stretch and produce an “embedded language island” (Myers Scotton 1993a). Thus, a model of bilingual speech must provide control procedures for the local matching of both language systems (cf. Myers Scotton and Jake 1995; Jake and Myers Scotton 1997).

Recently, MacSwan (1997, 1999) presented a minimalist approach to intrasentential code-switching. He claims that “nothing constrains code switching apart from the requirements of the mixed grammars”, a claim that does not entail a theory about which principles of grammar are relevant to code switching, but “leaves open any and all

independently motivated considerations in linguistic theory to the analysis of code-switching data". His approach is lexicalist. He assumes "that lexical items may be drawn from the lexicon of either language to introduce features into the numeration which must be checked for convergence in just the same way as monolingual features must be checked (or must not "mismatch"), with no special mechanisms permitted. (...) No "control structure" is required to mediate contradictory requirements of the mixed systems. The requirements are simply carried along with the lexical items of the respective systems." This approach is particularly interesting because there is no need for a kind of third grammar nor for specific universal principles for code-switching. A theory of a multilingual competence should thus be identical with any linguistic theory in general. Consequently, we may draw the conclusion that a linguistic theory must, in order to be complete, give a full account of the ways multilingual repertoires can be used to produce mixed utterances. We might quote, as an example, Kees de Bot who adapted Levelt's language production model in order to fit the specific operations of bilingual speech production (de Bot 1992). Thus, new research on the bilingual or multilingual lexicon (e.g. de Groot and Nas 1991, Cenoz et al. 2003) must be taken into account by every general theory of the lexicon. Vice versa, each lexical — and language — theory will have to be judged by its capacity to account for bilingual speech.

Stigmata or emblems?

As far as linguistic and psycholinguistic models are concerned, the investigators are free to define the premises of their theories and describe and explain their observations in a framework of their own. This is not the case for the domain of sociolinguistics and in particular for the question of the degree of acceptance of translinguistic markers. In other words, in order to answer this question, we need to analyse the beliefs of the community and, more generally, the socially constructed meaning of bilingualism and bilingual speech.

Multilingualism

Status and evaluation of translinguistic markers depend heavily on social representations of multilingualism. And the discussion about individual multilingualism is deeply influenced by a series of misunderstandings and stereotypes.

For many years, the popular belief was that a multilingual person should have learnt all of his or her languages simultaneously in early childhood and that he or she should have a native-like oral and written competence in all of them (cf. already Bloomfield 1933, 56). Today, a broader definition is more common. Accordingly, a person may be called multilingual if s/he uses his or her languages on a regular base and is able to switch from one to another where ever it is necessary, independently from the symmetry of his/her command of the languages, of the modalities of acquisition and of the distance between the varieties (cf. Haugen 1953, Oksaar 1980 and Grosjean 1982). Thus, a Sicilian guest worker

who learnt enough Swiss German dialect for his struggle for life in Switzerland may be considered bilingual with the same right (but not, of course, in the same way) as an interpreter working at the European Union and having systematically extended his or her 'native' French-English bilingualism.

In any case, the normal situation in a statistical sense is not constituted by monolingualism. At the end of the 20th century, one or another form of multilingualism affect 60 per cent of the world's population. In other words, monolingualism is a boundary case of multilingualism, originated by very specific cultural conditions — and bilingualism is a particular form of multilingualism.

Nevertheless, the ruling groups of a society often reject multilingualism in general. Their scepticism is founded upon two veins of tradition:

- the belief, expressed by the Bible, in the myth of the tower of Babel, that mankind was originally monolingual and that multilingualism resulted from the confusion of tongues by God and has since weighed upon humanity like a malediction (Moses I.11, 6-7);
- the idea, dating back to the days when European nation states were established, that 'states' naturally coincide with language territories and that 'national languages' are an important cohesive factor of 'nations'.

Both traditions originate from the stereotype, dating back to Greek philosophers, that monolingualism is the natural and politically legitimate state of mankind. In the time between French Revolution and Word War I and under the influence of the philosophy of Romanticism (for example Herder), this idea got ideological, almost religious dimensions

(Goebel 1989, 162ff.; Bronckart 1988, 122). The myth of the “urwüchsige Nation”, expressed by the national language, was born (Hentschel 1997; Schulze 1994).

Fortunately, the ideological background of these ideas has been deconstructed and demystified in recent years. Cultural philosophy denounces the stubbornness of all those who continue working for ‘monolingual’ solutions to the communicative problems of humanity on the basis of a ‘universal language’. Umberto Eco, for example, pleads for a “re-evaluation of Babel” (Le Monde, 7. 10. 1994). At a more practical level, politicians of the European Union and of the Council of Europe unanimously judge multilingualism as to be a part of Europe’s indisputable heritage (European Commission 1996, Conseil de l’Europe 1997).

Which status for translinguistic markers?

But how is multilingualism really judged? An important instrument used in answering this question is discourse analysis. The ways in which translinguistic markers are used by interlocutors during the conversation constitute a key issue in this respect.

Two traditions coincide in the literature on translinguistic markers. Those who adhere to “holistic” models of multilingualism conceive them as proof of a very high level of multilingual competence (Grosjean 1982, Lüdi and Py 1984, Heller 1988, Myers - Scotton 1993a and b etc.). On the other hand, they are considered as examples of linguistic degeneration (compare the references given by Cadiot 1987), as typical sign of learners’ approximate competence (e.g. Faerch and Kasper 1983a and b, Siguán 1987, 211, Perdue et

al. 1993), as an indicator of bilingual children's lack of capacity to separate their languages (Volterra and Taeschner 1978), or as evidence of a beginning language loss in a situation of languages in contact (Weltens et al. 1986). We will argue that these judgements frequently do not relate to the 'same' translinguistic markers.

The question of the status of translinguistic markers is of particular relevance where they are used to classify the speakers, i.e. to determine their social identity. It is well known that identity does not only serve to single out an individual, but also to determine his or her membership in a larger (linguistic, social, ethnic, etc.) group (cf. Le Page and Tabouret-Keller 1985, 3). Linguistic forms play a key role in this determination of one's "social identity"² (Labov 1976, 187 Giles, Scherer and Taylor, 1979). Some linguistic variables refer to components of identity as such as age, sex, social origins etc. that are not controlled by the speaker. Others "assume salience (...) in marking our beliefs about and attitudes towards (...) social categories" (Giles, Scherer and Taylor 1979, 344). The unconsciously "manifested" or "covert" identity is often not identical with the "claimed" identity (Centlivres 1986).

Translinguistic markers are particularly suited to indicating identity. But which identity? Is it a "manifested" or a "claimed" identity? Is it "emblematic" (accepted with pride) or "stigmatised" (something to be ashamed of)? And who is at the root of these evaluations?

Language mixture as stigma

The *stigmatising function* of translinguistic markers is grounded on general language value systems. Hybrid forms of languages are usually ranked very low on a prestige scale as is testified by several pejorative terms like “hybridisation” (Gardès-Madray and Brès, 1987, 79), “métissage” (Wald 1986, 62; from “métis” mestizo), «mixity» or «mixing» (Valdman ed. 1979, 10) etc. Cadiot (1987, 50) claims that the mixing of languages is traditionally viewed as shameful and even cursed. Even the less prestigious ‘pure’ language variety would be preferable to any form of language mixing that would indicate decay and lack of psychic stability.

French speakers are particularly eager to interpret translinguistic markers as an attack against the integrity of their language.³ But violations of prescriptive linguistic norms generate social proscription in other language communities too. Those who cannot properly speak — and write — will not get prestigious jobs and will be excluded from rewarding professional training possibilities as well as from important social functions. Lack of tolerance towards linguistic ‘errors’ develops thus into an instrument of power used by those who share the norm in order to maintain their superiority. In this sense, the investigation of the way translinguistic markers are treated makes an important contribution to the research on language attitudes and their consequences in language contact situations.

Exolingual functions of translinguistic markers

To speak a language variety primarily means acknowledging one's membership of a social group. Whoever doesn't speak a language well manifests, on the contrary, his or her "strangeness" and lack of familiarity with the norms of the group (Ehlich 1986, 48).

The manifestation of an outsider status can generate particular attention and willingness to help. The interlocutor knows s/he cannot take for granted that the speaker will adhere to usual comportment norms, which are inherent to the group membership. If somebody addresses me with the familiar 'Du' in German where the formal 'Sie' would be appropriate, I'll perceive this behaviour as impolite. But if s/he has a strong foreign accent, I'll debit this behaviour to her/his lack of language control and local rules and accept it. As it is, translinguistic markers are usually interpreted as indicators of lack of competence in the exolingual situation. They are part of communicative strategies used to overcome the asymmetrical control of the language used. In example (2), the use of German words by the interlocutor E (mostly with a rising intonation) regularly provokes V to propose the corresponding French word, which is often repeated by E. In addition to the immediate communicative functions, this is also a teaching-learning-strategy (Lüdi 1993, 1999).

However, group membership and its manifestation by language use are not value free. They are integrated in a system of social representations and principles. Each language variety has its own 'value' on the 'linguistic marketplace'. If translinguistic markers manifest the membership of the speaker to a socially or ethnically disdained group, translinguistic markers will have a stigmatising effect as in the case of a strong Turkish

accent in German. However, a disc jockey mixing German, Swiss German and English at a local radio station in Basle will lead to an increased audience...

Bilingual speech as an identity marker among multilinguals

The examples quoted above concern 'monolingual' situations. Despite the fact that multilinguals produce more translinguistic markers, they don't necessarily accept them. Monolingual ideologies often also determine the representations of multilingual persons. Thus, in a situation of immigration, the same traces of the host language when using the language of origin are judged by some speakers as an indicator of the beginning of a loss of identity while others see them as sign of a — positive — change of identity. The important point is not, in other words, whether the competence is modified or not, but rather which social meaning is attributed to these changes.

The following examples show the ambiguities in the evaluation of language mixing by civil servants of Swiss Italian origin living in the capital city of Bern. A first informant happens to use German words while speaking French to his wife. However she does not follow this pattern, even though her German is better than his, because she does not like mixing. This couple only uses lexical insertions in Italian with a teasing objective: "A me capita di mettere parole tedesche nel discorso ma mia moglie no perché anche se parla meglio di me il tedesco proprio non gli piace; mettiamo delle parole in italiano questo sì certe volte più per ridere che per altro". Another civil servant tells us that mixing is a frequent and tolerated habit among his friends. Nevertheless, he is afraid of falling into the

pitfall of interference, "nel tanto deprecato errore dell'interferenza." His attitude towards mixing is characterised by a lack of security. If he had a child, he would observe with interest its double language acquisition characterised by the mixing of both languages; he would watch this practice waiting to see signs of self-correction. But should the child still be mixing upon entering school, he would judge it as a lack of language competence in both languages (cf. Lüdi and Py et al. 1994 for complete results).

As can be seen, bilingual speech is assumed to be very frequent and a potential marker of bilingual identity. But very few bilinguals fully accept this behaviour. It is thus less an emblem of explicitly claimed bilingual identity than the means of its uncontrolled manifestation.

Let us add here that a formally identical translinguistic marker can convey very different social meanings in different situations of languages in contact. Consequently, the English-French bilinguals in Ottawa "flag" their translinguistic markers, i.e. they indicate they are consciously passing from one language to the other. The Spanish-English bilingual Puertoricans in New York prefer smooth forms of code-switching, probably because mixing phenomena are negatively marked in the first case (flagging is then a way of preserving one's face), but positively valued as emblem of a bilingual identity in the second.

In conclusion, the social meaning of translinguistic markers depends on the context. This is particularly true in diglossic situations where languages with different status and different communicative ranges are in contact, for example national languages being

confronted with the languages of historical minorities or with the languages of immigrants, i.e. of “new minorities” (Lüdi 1990).

Subcategories of translinguistic markers

In addition, it is questionable whether the translinguistic markers in all these cases are all ‘of the same kind’. Let us start by distinguishing along two dimensions:

First, one must distinguish between two classes of phenomena. One is at the language competence level (“langue”, as defined by Saussure), the other lies at the level of the enunciation process (or “parole”). Loan words, but also interferences in learners’ interlanguages belong to the first, code-switching and translinguistic wording⁴ to the second category.

Second, we shall elucidate a distinction between two types of speakers: (a) techniques used by competent speakers to expand the referential potential of their language (borrowing) or to fully exploit a bilingual repertoire (code-switching) and (b) traces of learners’ lack of competence like temporary rules in an interlanguage (interferences) or the conscious recourse to L1 because of limited lexical resources (translinguistic wording).

A more stringent examination, however, reveals that the distinction between the categories is somewhat ambiguous. It certainly cannot be “etically” determined from outside. In cases of exolingual interaction determined by strongly unbalanced competencies, we found examples of code-switching (i. e. use of L1 that was interactively interpreted as bilingual strategy with precise discourse functions; cf. Lüdi 1993). On the

other hand, even competent bilinguals (and monolinguals!) may sometimes find themselves in situations of lexical distress and may resort to translinguistic wording. Likewise a distinction between stigmatising and emblematic translinguistic markers based on purely formal criteria is not possible as we have seen; it is on the contrary crucial to know which status and functions are attributed to them interactively. In a way, translinguistic markers serve a double purpose. They are firstly traces of the definition of the situation by the partners, but they serve secondly also as means for the partners to do this definition work. This either on the bilingual-monolingual axis, or on the exolingual - endolingual axis (Lüdi 1993). In this sense, each language choice and each translinguistic marker represents an “act of identity” (Le Page and Tabouret-Keller 1985) manifesting the desired social membership of the speaker. As any other form of social identity, multilingual identity is constantly being redefined as part of the continuous evolution of social interactions (Stienen and Wolf 1991, 101).

It is true that the processes shaping linguistic identities take place in a social environment only partially controlled by the affected persons. An existing system of linguistic values determines which “linguistic capital” the knowledge and use of one or the other variety convey (Gumperz 1982, Bourdieu 1982). Conflicts between different systems of linguistic values arise frequently, for example between linguistic minorities and majorities. But despite these facts, we are not just determined in the way we use our repertoires. This applies particularly if we swap a perspective that is centred on modelling the behaviour of speakers or hearers for an interactive perspective. Interactivity means a reciprocal definition of the situation of communication by all interacting partners (Schuetz

1967). Based upon Schegloff's definition of "discourse as an interactional achievement" (Schegloff 1982), we claim that the meaning and status of translinguistic markers are *locally* negotiated and defined by the partners — in the compass of systems of social values, but sometimes with the explicit intention of questioning and reshaping these systems.

Translinguistic markers are ideally suited to analyse and exemplify such processes of negotiation, because amongst other things they are particularly striking and "visible" to all participants.

Translinguistic markers as traces of a contact between 'codes' or as manifestation of a plural repertoire?

From on-line mixing to an autonomous variety?

The discussion about code-switching normally grounds on the following premises:

- the matrix language can be identified unequivocally;
- there are two clearly distinct social varieties;
- there is an "on line"-switching between a matrix and an embedded language which are both also used in their "pure" form by the same speakers, sometimes even in the same situation;

- the two language systems are separated in the brain; namely the bilingual speaker possesses one set of lexical items per language even if there is a common underlying conceptual system (Paradis 1980, 1985, 1995).

Given these assumptions, one doubts considering code switching as an autonomous variety. We may indeed define ‘bilingual speech’ (with many additional differentiations) as a register or style appropriate to a ‘bilingual’ situation, but in the compass of such a style the speakers rely freely and spontaneously on two varieties of their repertoire simultaneously.

But there may well be cases where not all the premises hold true.

The case of Chiac in Acadia

Chiac is the name of a contact variety resulting from the extensive cohabitation of French and English speakers in the region of Moncton (New Brunswick), Canada. It is namely the vernacular of the younger generation and can be exemplified by utterances as the following:

- (3) *je l’ai juste appelé but i était pas là / i m’a back appelé la même soirée* (Perrot 1994, 243)
I just called him but he wasn’t there / he called me back the same evening

Recently, there have been pieces of literature written in Chiac as the novel “Bloupe” published by Jean Babineau in 1993.

Several authors have put forward the hypothesis that Chiac represents an autonomous variety alongside English and French (for example Gerin and Philipponneau

1984, Perrot 1994, Boudreau and Perrot 1994). However, in order to consider Chiac as “régé par ses propres règles, et non comme le résultat hétéroclite d’une sorte de «mélange arbitraire»” (1994, 274), there is no need to admit a separate variety (in the sense of an autonomous system). To explain these regularities, it seems at first glance sufficient to admit the existence of a “grammar of code-switching”, i.e. that switching codes is rule-governed, that switching points are not arbitrary but result from an analysis of the congruence of both language structures and that code-switching is functional (see namely the work done by Myers Scotton and her colleagues, Auer ed. 1998 and the synthesis in Milroy and Muysken 1995). At a second glance, however, there are good reasons to argue in favour of the hypothesis of a third, autonomous code resulting from the contact, i. e. a “troisième code autonome par rapport aux deux codes en contact dont il est issu” (ibid.), what Auer 1999 would certainly call a « fused lect »:

- This form of speech has its own name (Chiac) and plays an important role in the triglossic repertoire of the region. It also holds a well defined position in the local language value system where it has both negative and positive connotations as it functions as an emblem of group identity (Boudreau and Perrot 1994, 277f.).
- Even if the frequency of English within the various oral corpora varies significantly from speaker to speaker, there seem to be common patterns: “une homogénéité d’ensemble, vérifiée à partir de récurrences assez fréquentes pour être véritablement significatives” (Boudreau and Perrot 1994, 274).

- Perrot's work on *back* and *still* (1994) shows usage patterns for both morphemes differing from those for the English as well as from those for the corresponding French words.
- A comparison between corpora collected at intervals of several decades shows how these rules emerge and stabilise.
- In addition, one could argue that the third code corresponds to an autonomous regional culture, an "interculture" (Koole and ten Thije 1994) resulting from the contact between Francocanadian and Anglocanadian concepts and values.

But there are also several arguments against the assumption of a third code:

- We do not only find lexically integrated anglicisms like *starter*, *watcher*, *caller*, *back* etc., but also spontaneous lexical insertions (lexical code-switching, nonce-borrowing) as well as longer English islands, also known from other situations of languages in contact.
- The students analysed by Perrot and Boudreau consider themselves as French speakers even if they evaluate their vernacular rather negatively in opposition to the mythical French norm.
- Based on criteria such as morpheme frequency and grammatical structure, the matrix language is clearly French.
- Speakers do not stick to this register. In the presence of a monolingual French interviewer they try - with good results - to adapt their speech to the monolinguality of the situation, i. e. to speak their best possible French and to eliminate as far as possible all traces of their bilingualism.

- On the other hand, English embedded islands completely follow the rules of English.
- Finally, the regional culture is not stable either but is characterised by dynamic changes due to the growing mobility of the population, access to the new media etc.

These observations might not be sufficient to exclude the hypothesis of a ‘third code’. But they remind us of the fact that interpretation of the data is not simple. In opposition to Gerin and Philipponeau, Perrot and Boudreau, we prefer to construct a tentative explanation as follows:

Firstly, the matrix language is not standard French, but a regional variety⁵ shaped by centuries of contact with English and characterised by numerous English loans which have been extensively modified and integrated and do not follow the English patterns any more (e. g. *back* and *still*).

Secondly, we find code-switching techniques that are ‘normal’ in situations of language contact characterised by frequent individual bilingualism, i. e. (a) mixed constituents formed by the on-line insertion of English lexical units into French propositions and (b) — less frequently — English embedded islands. And this code-switchings clearly assume local or global functions. It is thus a form of bilingual speech which is normally spoken in very informal situations and can exceptionally be exploited for literary purposes (e. g. by Jean Babineau). The French spoken in formal situations can then better match the standard norm.

What the speakers themselves call Chiac is, in fact, a combination of regional dialect and code-switching. They do not choose between ‘regional French’ and ‘French & English’, but they chose to use (1) a ‘regiolect’ and (2) ‘English/French bilingual speech’.

Lead by their normative consciousness, normally acquired at school, the speakers are willing — and able — to avoid not only anglicisms, but also other strongly marked regional forms in situations perceived as formal. They are, in a way, gliding up and down a continuous scale between standard and regional French.

The result is an increasing tension between the norm and the emblematic bilingual and regional speech: “Le changement en cours se fait dans deux directions tout à fait opposées, d’un côté vers un français plus standard, de l’autre vers un français plus anglicisé” (Péronnet 1996:121).

The case of Italoschwyz in Zurich

Originating in Italy, more or less continuous migration movements have reached the larger cities in the German part of Switzerland over the last century. When the migrant workers first arrived they intended to return soon to their country of origin. Socio-political measures supporting the reunion of families and the macroeconomic development in both countries motivated many Italians to stay in Switzerland. This led to a growing Italian-Swiss community raising their children in Switzerland, who are commonly referred to as “second generation”. Since the late seventies and early eighties a typical form of code switching has

been observed among these adolescents. This is correlated to their bilingual identity as well as the discovery of their own cultural roots.

Franceschini (1998a, 59s.) published the following typical example:

- (4) A: *perché meinsch che se tu ti mangi Emmentaler o se tu ti mangi una fontina isch au en*
because, do you mean, that when you eat Emmentaler cheese or when you eat a Fontina there is also a
- Unterschied, oder? schlussendlich è sempre dentro lì però il gusto isch andersch.*
difference isn't it? finally it is always in there but the taste is different
- B: *è vero!*
that's true

Forms of bilingual speech have also been adopted by the “first generation” which normally has a lower competence in the host language. For this reason, their switches show different patterns and are in general limited to insertion of discourse markers like *joo [yeah]*, *oder [isn't it]* and *meinsch [you mean]* (Franceschini 1998a, 56).

For Franceschini several observations can be interpreted in the way that there is some kind of autonomous variety emerging out from this practice:

- The members of the community have coined a name for this “mixture”; they call it “italo-schwyz”;
- this type of bilingual speech is also used by friends and peers who do not have Italian roots, in other words it is “learnable” (Franceschini 1998a, 57); it is not motivated by the wish to express a certain national or ethnic identity, but rather to signal the (temporary) willingness to be a member of the respective group;
- a single switch often does not seem to have “local” conversational functions (ibid., 61); the two languages are in a kind of free variation.

Franceschini concludes from her observations: “code-switching resembles the use of a code in itself, a language of its own” (loc.cit.).

Have we really crossed the boundary between switching from one variety to another and a new, autonomous variety? I doubt it for several reasons:

- In the examples quoted by Franceschini, nothing indicates that the members of the “italo-schwyz” group are not able to speak each of their two languages in a monolingual mode, that is to switch off the “other” language where the situation requires it (e. g. in the class-room or in interaction with relatives living in the region of origin), even if they may have some difficulties due to their asymmetric bilingualism.
- The case of the Swiss German friends of italo-schwyz is certainly different. However, if we admit that they have an astonishingly high passive competence in Italian (a fact brought forward by Franceschini herself), we may hypothetically explain their behaviour as code-switching between their Italian interlanguage and Swiss German in a situation they perceive as bilingual. This type of “bilingual” behaviour of learners has also been observed in other situations (cf. Rampton 1997, Lüdi 1999).
- It is well known that bilingual speech as such can be the normal, “unmarked” choice for bilingual communities in bilingual situations and that single switches do not, then, necessarily perform local discourse functions (Lüdi and Py ³2003, Myers Scotton 1993a).⁶

Further and more detailed research will be necessary in order to clarify definitively the precise status of Italo-schwyz. But there are sound arguments supporting the hypothesis that the process of stabilisation and grammaticalisation of Italoschwyz is less advanced than in the case of Chiac.

What is a 'language'?

There is, however, another possible explanation. Isn't the basic question we asked at the beginning turning out to be wrong? Indeed the examples quoted suggest a redefinition of our initial problem: in order to characterise the status of code-switching as a variety of its own, neither a formal definition of the term language itself nor new boundaries between 'one language' and 'two languages' are required. Possibly even the term code switching is misleading, as suggested by the title of an article by Penelope Gardner-Chloros (1995) evoking the "myth of the discreteness of linguistic systems".

The term 'code-switching' indeed implies the existence of clearly separated linguistic systems between which switching takes place. For Myers-Scotton "well-formedness" of the constituents either in the matrix language or in the embedded language is an obvious premise of her model, even in the case of code-switching between a standard variety and a dialect or between dialects, styles and registers (Myers-Scotton 1993b, 3).

However research results raise doubts about the universal validity of this premise (Lüdi 1998a):

The promoters of a “polylectal grammar” (e. g. Berrendonner 1983) claim that the principle of variation is constitutive for all languages. Single “lects” (sociolects, dialects, chronolects, styles etc.) exploit an existing space of variation in different ways. A clear difference is made between the grammaticality of a variant and its (social, stylistic etc.) meaning. If one admits that bilinguality is an extension of polylectality (see Lüdi and Py 1984, ³2003 for such a position), the question must be raised as to whether the attribution of the Chiac *back* to one or the other single language grammar is at all relevant.

In such a space of variation, the existence of clearly separated varieties does not result from a law of nature, but from an important focussing effort of the speakers as suggested by Le Page and Tabouret-Keller (1985). Linguistic norms are the result of such an effort, i. e. of a repeated coherent selection of variables, by the individual as well as by the group (1985, 181f.). But there are also speakers and groups using “diffuse, or non focussed linguistic systems” (loc.cit.), where variables co-occur that are otherwise clearly assigned to two different lects. When Tabouret-Keller was asked to reanalyse her Belize materials for the Neuchâtel symposium on languages in contact in 1987, her conclusion was that the term ‘translinguistic marker’ defined as a trace of language A in utterances in language B did not apply, because there were no discrete systems in contact, but rather a kind of variational continuum (Tabouret-Keller 1987, 237). For similar reasons, Gardner-Chloros argues, “that what has been called code-switching in fact merges into various other interlingual phenomena, and that drawing clear lines between these phenomena is an ideological rather than an objective linguistic activity” (1995, 70).

Interpretation of what ‘a language’ is — and where the boundaries between different ‘languages’ lie — is highly ideologically biased. Some politicians in Valencia (Spain) argue for instance that their idiom, defined by all linguists as a variety of Catalan, is an autonomous ‘language’. They try to make the difference more visible by reforming the orthography (Strubell 1994). Similar attempts have been made in regard to Serbian and Croatian (and Bosnian). On the other hand, Flemings and Dutchmen insist that their idioms appertain to the same diasystem and manifest this claim by a common standardisation effort (Deprez and Wynants 1994).

Thus, Franceschini (1998a) is certainly right when she maintains, with reference to Gumperz (1982) and Le Page and Tabouret-Keller (1985), that “shaping linguistic differences also has an identity function”. However, she offers additional insight. In her publications (1998b, 1999) she argues that the single speaker’s linguistic repertoire is not composed of various single language systems, but represents, in fact, only one holistic system. It “consists of his/her linguistic abilities, which s/he has acquired through interaction in the course of her/his biography”. In this model, monolingual speech corresponds to a focussing effort on the norms of a single language. Franceschini coins the term of “monofocus of attention” (1998a). In bilingual mode, focus lies on two varieties simultaneously: “a CS speaker can now be represented as a bi-focalising speaker” (loc.cit.).

Comparing different strands of research on code-switching reveals additional difficulties. Starting on different premises, linguistic, sociolinguistic, psycholinguistic and interactional models arrive at results which are not always inter-compatible. In my synthesis of a workshop on code-switching in November 1990, I wrote: “As it is, code-

switching has in fact proven to represent a litmus test for different interfaces between linguistic, psychological and sociological theories”. I argued in favour of one single model “which would allow an integration of linguistic constraints (formal properties of linguistic systems), psychological constraints (properties of the human brain) and socio-pragmatic constraints (social and interactional properties of social systems in general and/or of specific social systems in particular)” (Lüdi 1991). The participants at the colloquium questioned whether such a model could be developed in the next decade. Indeed such a model remains to be established.

As a matter of fact, all positions quoted above are based upon a linguistic, sociolinguistic or psycholinguistic perspective. The question as to whether code-switching is a variety of its own or a combination of several varieties is almost never addressed in an interdisciplinary way. At the moment, the — unsatisfactory — conclusion seems to be that Chiac is grammatically on the way to developing its own set of norms in the compass of Acadian French, that Italo-schwyz can be defined socio-pragmatically as an individual variety (resulting from a bi-focalisation on Swiss German and Italian) etc. The issue remains unresolved as to whether Perrot’s method and Franceschini’s approach would produce similar results for Italo-schwyz and Chiac respectively. And we are far away from psycho- and neuro-linguistic confirmations of the kind Grosjean, Paradis and others request. Thus, it seems probable that the decision of as to whether Italo-schwyz, Chiac, etc. represent autonomous varieties or not, will be heavily biased by the subdiscipline investigating the issue.

Perspectives

We stated at the beginning that we would analyse ‘magnifying-glass effects’ at three different levels. Our main conclusion is that the way language studies have been conceived in the past is questionable. Often enough they have been heavily influenced by a ‘monolingual’ ideology. Even research on second language acquisition was founded on the premise that the goal to reach is a ‘native like’ (i. e. monolingual) competence in L2. Bilingualism was seen as the addition of — more or less perfect — competencies in single languages. Fortunately the developments sketched in previous sections are gaining growing acceptance but they are still a long way from being incorporated in mainstream textbooks.

We fully agree with Franceschini (1999), who criticises a “riduzione di complessità persino grottesca” (p. 254), a quasi grotesque reduction of the complexity of language behaviour in most linguistic models and postulates a theory of language taking into account the complexity of modern societies, namely the diversity, lack of stability and variability of language use in the large metropolitan areas (but Le Page and Tabouret-Keller have shown similar phenomena in rural areas). Research on language acquisition confirms the high degree of unpredictability and the complex dynamics of face to face interaction in authentic interaction (and the lack of consideration of this fact in second language teaching) (Lüdi, Pekarek and Saudan 2001, Pekarek 1999). At the same time, it sheds new light on the ways native and non-native speakers of a language take mutual profit in their entire repertoires using their respective first languages and other support languages (e .g. English when speaking French as L2 (Lüdi in press), French, English, Spanish and Latin when speaking

Italian (Franceschini 1999) etc.). We thus need a language theory giving special prominence to the ways the interlocutors exploit all the resources that are at their disposal.

Franceschini resumes her considerations as follows:

“...concepisco il sistema linguistico a partire del suo uso in interazioni: è attraverso l’uso che il Sistema Lingua emerge nello sviluppo umano, sia nella filo- che nell’ontogenesi. La lingua si è sviluppata sì su una base biologica, ma sempre nel contesto delle interazioni sociali.” (p. 272).⁷

At this point, one should not forget the extreme diversity of ways multilingual repertoires are built and work, originating from double L1-acquisition, second (or third) language acquisition in social contexts by adult immigrants or from formal language tuition in the class room. Most forms of (second) language acquisition do not lead to a “perfect” competence. There are good reasons why educational language policy makers begin to question the myth that students are to acquire native-like competencies in modern languages at school (Lüdi 1998c).

We assume here that learning a (second) language is a series of cognitive procedures by which the learner progressively constructs the grammar of the new language, not only assisted by a “language acquisition device” (more for L1, less for L2), but also and significantly thanks to support from more competent members of the community (Vygotsky 1978, 86) in the compass of a “language acquisition support system” based on social interaction (Bruner 1982, 1983). Research on second language acquisition has shown the importance of a set of interactive procedures. These may be observed in exolingual situations that provide the non-native speaker the necessary help not only to communicate, but also to continue his/her learning process (e.g. Krafft and Dausendschön-Gay 1994).

Languages are learnt at different ages, in different situations and up to very different levels of competence. This has of course consequences for the way multilingual repertoires will be structured. It is thus crucial to analyse the social context in which the different varieties making up a multilingual repertoire have been acquired. Recent research has shown for instance that “passive” exposure to other languages during childhood can lead to an unfocussed form of language learning and to a form of competence that can be reactivated at later stages if necessary (Ellis 1995, Franceschini 1996, 1999).

However, the question whether we may speak of one entwined or several separated systems cannot be fully answered by linguists alone. Neurosciences may offer additional insights. Thanks to the functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) we can actually observe in detail how the brain processes linguistic (and other) data. Do early bilinguals process language data the same way (i. e. in the same areas of the brain) as late bilinguals? Is there a difference between balanced and unbalanced bilinguals? What is the relation between the neuronal network constructed when learning a second language and the ‘classical’ language centres? Can the first be integrated into the latter? Can early bilingualism support these processes? At the moment, research findings in the neuroanatomy of bilinguals are still contradictory (e g. Paradis 1995, Kim et al. 1997, Perani et al. 1996, 1998, Dehaene et al 1997). The analysis of cases of bilingual speech used by speakers with different kinds of multilingual competencies could shed new light on these questions. What is the relation between the modalities of language acquisition, contexts and grammatical structure of translinguistic markers? Is there a correlation between these findings and the areas activated in the brain? First research results in this

direction exist. At the University of Basle for example, seven right-handed subjects, aged between 20 and 35 years, fluent in three languages, were requested to formulate covertly the routine of the previous day. They were classified into *early bilinguals* (two languages before the age of 3 years, n=3) and *late bilinguals* (second language after the age of 9 years, n=4). All subjects had acquired a third language at school. By carefully controlling for language and baseline condition, a regional activation pattern in Broca's area during free language production was found. This pattern varies for each language of a multilingual person and has the following properties: firstly, simultaneously acquired early languages differ less in their demands on neural substrate than late languages. Secondly, in a comparison between early- and late-acquired languages, the separate analysis of both subfields of Broca show that BA 44, in particular, behaves in a clearly defined manner. Thus, early bilinguals seem to build up a network in BA 44 sufficiently adaptable to allow the integration of later acquired languages. Late bilinguals have to establish new neural areas to guarantee development of their late-acquired languages. (Wattendorf and Westermann et al. 2001). These results could have an important impact on the structure of an integrated language theory.

Such a theory will consider multilingual repertoires and their use in different contexts the default case, monolingual competencies and monolingual speech representing just one many cases to be explained. It will match new ways of modelling the dynamics of intercultural communication and contribute to it.

References

- Auer, Peter
1984 *Bilingual conversation*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
1990 "A discussion paper on code alternation". In *ESF Network on Code-Switching and Language Contact: Papers for the workshop on concepts, methodology and data*. Basel, 12 - 13 January 1990. Strasbourg: European Science Foundation, 69-87.
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 (ed)
1998 *Code-switching in conversation*. London: Routledge.
- Berrendonner, Alain
1983 *Principes de grammaire polylectale*. Lyon: P.U.L.
- Bloomfield, Leonard
1933 *Language*. New York: H. Holt.
- Boudreau, Annette and Perrot, Marie-Eve
1994 "Productions discursives d'un groupe d'adolescents acadiens du sud-est du Nouveau-Brunswick. Là je me surveille, là j'me watch pas ". In *Sociolinguistique et aménagement des langues. Actes du XVIe Colloque annuel de l'Association de linguistique des Provinces atlantiques*, D. Philipponneau (ed), 271-285. Moncton: Centre de recherche en linguistique appliquée.
- Bourdieu, Pierre
1982 *Ce que parler veut dire: L'économie des échanges linguistiques*. Paris: Fayard.
- Bronckart, Jean-Paul
1988 "Fonctionnement langagier et entreprises normatives". In *La langue française est-elle gouvernable?* G. Schöni et al (eds), 109-132. Neuchâtel and Paris: Delachaux & Niestlé,
- Bruner, Jerome
1982 "The formats of language acquisition". *American Journal of Semiotics* 1: 1-16.
1983 *Child's talk. Learning to use language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cadiot, Pierre
1987 "Les mélanges de langue". In *France, pays multilingue. t.2: Pratiques des langues en France*, G. Vermes and J. Boutet (eds) 50-61. Paris: l'Harmattan.
- Cenoz, Jasone, Hufeisen, Brigitte and Jessner, Ulrike (eds)
2003 *The multilingual lexicon*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Centlivres, Pierre
1986 "L'identité régionale: langages et pratiques. Approche ethnologique, Suisse romande et Tessin". In *Regionale Identität und Perspektiven: fünf sozialwissenschaftliche Ansätze - Les sciences sociales face à l'identité régionale: cinq approches*, P. Centlivres et al. (eds), 77-126. Berne: Haupt.
- Conseil de l'Europe
1997 *Apprentissage des langues et citoyenneté européenne. Rapport final 1989-1996*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- De Bot, Kees
1992 "A bilingual production model: Levelt's 'speaking' model adapted". *Applied Linguistics* 13(1): 1-24.
- De Groot, Annette and Nas, Gerard
1991 "Lexical representations of cognates and noncognates in compound bilinguals". *Journal of Memory and Language* 30: 90-123.
- Dehaene, Stanislas and Dupoux, Emmanuel and Mehler, Jacques et al
1997 "Anatomical variability in the cortical representation of first and second language". *NeuroReport* 8: 3809-3815.
- Deprez, Kas and Wynants, Armel

- 1994 "Les Flamands et leur(s) langue(s)". In *Sprachstandardisierung*, G. Lüdi (ed), 41-64. Freiburg: Universitätsverlag.
- Ehlich, Konrad
1986 "Xenismen und die bleibende Fremdheit des Fremdsprachensprechers". In *Integration und Identität. Soziokulturelle und psychopädagogische Probleme im Sprachunterricht mit Ausländern*, E. Hess-Lüttich (ed), 43-54. Tübingen: Narr.
- Ellis, Rod
1995 *Understanding second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- ESF
1991 *ESF Network on Code-switching and Language Contact. Papers for the workshop on impact and consequences: broader considerations, Brussels, 22-24 November 1990*, Strasbourg: European Science Foundation.
- European Commission
1996 *White Paper on education and training. Teaching and learning - Towards the learning society*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
- Faerch, Claus and Kasper, Gabriele
1983a "Plans and strategies in foreign language communication", In *Strategies in Interlanguage Communication*, C. Faerch and G. Kasper (eds), 20-60. London and New York: Longman,
1983b "On identifying communication strategies in interlanguage production". In *Strategies in Interlanguage Communication*, C. Faerch and G. Kasper (eds), 210-238. London and New York: Longman.
- Fishman, Joshua
1967 "Bilingualism with and without diglossia; diglossia with and without bilingualism". *Journal of Social Issues* 23(2): 29-38.
- Franceschini, Rita
1995 "Immacolata Amodeo: «Unter fremdem Himmel»": In *Letteratura de-centrata. Italienische Autorinnen und Autoren in Deutschland*, C. Lüderssen and S.A. Sanna (eds), 72-77. Frankfurt a.M.: Diesterweg.
1996 "Die Reaktivierung von latenten Kompetenzen bei Gelegenheitsprechern". In *Sémantique et cognition. Sciences cognitives, Linguistique et Intelligence Artificielle*, M. Riegel (ed), (Scolia) 9: 85-109.
1998a "Code Switching and the notion of code in Linguistics: proposals for a dual focus model". In *Code-switching in conversation*, P. Auer (ed), 51-72. London: Routledge.
1998b "Varianz innerhalb zweier Sprachsysteme: eine Handlungswahl?". In *Varianz als Ergebnis von Handlungswahl*, B. Henn-Memmesheimer (ed), 11-26. Tübingen: Narr.
1999 *Italiano di contatto: Parlanti occasionali e riattivazioni di conoscenze non focalizzate*. Basel, Habilitationsschrift.
- Gardès-Madray, Françoise and Brès, Jacques
1987 "Conflits de nomination en situation diglossique". In *France, pays multilingue. t.2: Pratiques des langues en France*, G. Vermes and J. Boutet (eds), 78-90. Paris: l'Harmattan.
- Gardner-Chloros, Penelope
1991 *Language selection and switching in Strasbourg*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
1995 "Code-switching in the community, regional and national repertoires: the myth of the discreteness of linguistic systems". In *One speaker, two languages. Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching*, L. Milroy and P. Muysken (eds), 68-89. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gérin, Pierre and Philipponeau, Catherine
1984 "La création d'un troisième code comme mode d'adaptation à une situation où deux langues sont en contact, le chiac". In *Variation du comportement langagier lorsque deux langues sont en contact*. A. Prujiner et al. (eds), Québec: Université Laval.
- Giles, Howard, Scherer, Klaus and Taylor, Donald

- 1979 "Speech markers in social interaction". In *Social markers in speech*, K. Scherer and H. Giles (eds), 343-381. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press and Paris: Editions de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme.
- Goebel, Hans
1989 "Spracheinheit — unité de la langue — unità della lingua — unidad de la lengua. Bemerkungen zur Problematik des Sprachunitarismus". In *Fédéralisme, régionalisme et droit des groupes ethniques en Europe. Hommage à Guy Héraud*, F. Riedl (ed), 162-171. Wien: Braumüller.
- Grosjean, François
1982 *Life with two languages: an introduction to bilingualism*. Cambridge MA.: Harvard University Press.
1985 "The bilingual as a competent but specific speaker-hearer". *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural development* 6: 467-477.
- Grutman, Rainier
1997 *Des langues qui résonnent: L'hétérolinguisme au XIXe siècle québécois*. Montréal, Fides-CÉTUQ.
- Gumperz, John
1967 "On the linguistic markers of bilingual communication". *Journal of Social Issues* 23: 48-57.
1982 *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Haugen, Einar
1953 *The Norwegian Language in America: A study in bilingual behavior*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Heller, Monica (ed)
1988 *Codeswitching : Anthropological and Sociolinguistic Perspectives*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hentschel, Gerd (ed)
1997 *Über Muttersprachen und Vaterländer: Zur Entwicklung von Standardsprachen und Nationen in Europa*. Frankfurt am Main: Lang.
- Jake, Jane and Myers-Scotton, Carol
1997 "Codeswitching and compromise strategies: Implications for lexical structure". *The International Journal of Bilingualism* 1: 25-39.
- Kim, Karl H.S., Relkin, Norman R., Lee, Kyoung-Min and Hirsch, Joy
1997 "Distinct cortical areas associated with native languages". *Nature* 388: 171-174.
- Koole, Tom and Thijs, Jan D. ten
1994 *The construction of intercultural discourse: Team discussion of educational advisers*. Amsterdam and Atlanta: RODOPI.
- Krafft, Ulrich and Dausendschön-Gay, Ulrich
1994 "Analyse conversationnelle et recherche sur l'acquisition". *Bulletin suisse de linguistique appliquée* 59: 127-158.
- Labov, William
1976 *Sociolinguistique*. Paris: Minuit.
- Laurie, Simon S.
1890 *Lectures on Language and Linguistic Method in School*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Le Page, Robert and Tabouret-Keller, Andrée
1985 *Acts of identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lüderssen, Caroline and Sanna, Salvatore A. (eds)
1995 *Letteratura de-centrata. Italianische Autorinnen und Autoren in Deutschland*. Frankfurt am Main: Diesterweg.
- Lüdi, Georges
1986 "Forms and functions of bilingual speech in pluricultural migrant communities in Switzerland". In *The Fergusonian Impact. Vol. 2: Sociolinguistics and the Sociology of*

- Language*, J.A. Fishman et al (eds), 217-236. Berlin, New York and Amsterdam: Mouton de Gruyter.
- 1987 “Les marques transcodiques: regards nouveaux sur le bilinguisme” In *Devenir bilingue — parler bilingue*, G. Lüdi (ed), 1-21. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- 1990 “Les migrants comme minorité linguistique en Europe”. *Sociolinguistica* 4: 113-135.
- 1991 “Synthesis of the Workshop on «Impact and consequences: broader considerations»”. In *ESF* 1991, 1-3.
- 1993 “Statuts et fonctions des marques transcodiques en conversation exolingue”, In *Actes du XXe Congrès International de Linguistique et Philologie Romane. t. III*, G. Hilty (ed), 123-136. Tübingen: Narr.
- 1997 “Aspects cognitifs du parler bilingue“, In *Etudes récentes en linguistique de contact. [Plurilingua XX]*, N. Labrie (ed), 250-259. Bonn: Dümmler.
- 1998a “Le code-switching comme variété mixte?” *Sociolinguistica* 12: 140-154.
- 1998b “«Zweisprachige Rede» in literarischen Texten“, In *et multum et multa. Festschrift für Peter Wunderli zum 60. Geburtstag*, E. Werner et al. (eds), 347-357. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.
- 1998c “How can a coherent educational policy support multilingual repertoires?“ In *Modern language learning and teaching in central and eastern Europe: which diversification and how can it be achieved? Proceedings of the second colloquy of the European Center for Modern Languages, Graz (13 – 15 February 1997)*, B. Fink (ed), 329 – 336. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Press.
- 1999 “Alternance des langues et acquisition d’une langue seconde”. In Castellotti, V. and Moore, D. (eds), *Alternance des langues et construction de savoirs. Cahiers du français contemporain* 5: 25-51.
- in press “Mehrsprachigkeit, Code-switching und Wortfindungsprozesse”, In Schecker, Michael. (ed)
- 2001 “Le «mélange de langues» comme moyen stylistique et / ou comme marqueur d’appartenance dans le discours littéraire”. In *Ecrire aux confins des langues. Actes du colloque de Mulhouse 30, 31 janvier et 1er février 1997*. [Crealiana, volume hors série I], J. Bem and A. Hudlett (eds), 13-31. Mulhouse: Centre de Recherche sur l’Europe littéraire,
- 2003 “Code-switching and unbalanced bilingualism”, In *Bilingualism: Beyond Basic Principles. Festschrift in honour of Hugo Baetens Beardsmore*, J.-M. Dewaele and A. Housen and W. Li (eds), 174-188. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Lüdi, Georges, Pekarek, Simona and, Saudan, Victor
- 2001 *Französischlernen in der Deutschschweiz. Zur Entwicklung der diskursiven Fähigkeiten innerhalb und ausserhalb der Schule*. Chur and Zürich, Rüegger.
- Lüdi, Georges and Py, Bernard
- 1984 *Zweisprachig durch Migration: Einführung in die Erforschung der Mehrsprachigkeit am Beispiel zweier Zuwanderergruppen in Neuenburg (Schweiz)*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- 2003 *Etre bilingue*. 3e éd. revue. Berne. Francfort -s. Main and New York: Lang.
- Lüdi, Georges and Py, Bernard et al.
- 1994 *Fremdsprachig im eigenen Land: Wenn Binnenwanderer in der Schweiz das Sprachgebiet wechseln und wie sie darüber reden*. Basel: Helbing und Lichtenhahn.
- MacSwan, Jeff
- 1999 *A Minimalist Approach to Intrasentential Code Switching*. New York: Garland Press.
- 2000 The Architecture of the Bilingual Language Faculty: Evidence from Intrasentential Code Switching. *Bilingualism* 3: 37-54.
- Milroy, Lesley and Muysken, Pieter (eds)
- 1995 *One speaker, two languages: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching*. Cambridge, London and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Myers-Scotton, Carol
- 1993a *Social Motivations for Codeswitching: Evidence from Africa*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

- 1993b, ²1997 *Dueling languages: Grammatical structure in codeswitching*. Oxford: Clarendon Press (1997 edition with a new afterword).
- Myers-Scotton, Carol and Jake, Jane
1995 "Matching lemmas in bilingual competence and performance model: evidence from intrasentential code switching". *Linguistics* 33: 98-124.
- Oksaar, Els
1980 "Mehrsprachigkeit, Sprachkontakt und Sprachkonflikt". In *Sprachkontakt und Sprachkonflikt*, P.H. Nelde (ed), 43-51. Wiesbaden: Steiner.
- Paradis, Michel
1980 "The language switch in bilinguals: psycholinguistic and neurolinguistic perspectives". In *Languages in contact and conflict*, Nelde, P.H. (ed), 501-6. Wiesbaden: Steiner.
1985 "On representation of two languages in one brain". *Language Sciences* 7: 1-40.
- Paradis, Michel (ed)
1995 *Aspects of bilingual aphasia*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Pekarek, Simona
1999 "*Leçons de conversation*": *dynamiques de l'interaction et acquisition de compétences discursives*. Neuchâtel and Paris: Delachaux and Niestlé.
- Perani, Daniela, Dehaene, Stanislas and Grassi, Franco et al.
1996 "Brain processing of native and foreign languages". *NeuroReport* 7: 2439-2444
- Perani, Daniela, Paulesu, Eraldo and Galles, Nuria Sebastian et al.
1998 "The bilingual brain. Proficiency and age of acquisition of the second language". *Brain* 121: 1841-1852
- Perdue, Clive (ed)
1993 *Adult language acquisition: cross-linguistic perspectives*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Péronnet, Louise
1996 "Nouvelles variétés du français parlé en Acadie du Nouveau-Brunswick", In *Les Acadiens et leur(s) langue(s) quand le français est minoritaire*. L. Dubois and A. Boudreau (eds), 121-135. Moncton: CRLA / Les éditions d'Acadie.
- Perrot, Marie-Eve
1994 "Le chiac ou ... whatever: Le vernaculaire des jeunes d'une école secondaire francophone de Moncton". *Etudes canadiennes* 37: 237-246.
- Rampton, Ben
1997 *Language Crossing and the Redefinition of Reality: Implications for Research on Codeswitching community*. Paper 5. King's College London
- Romaine, Susan
1989, ²1995 *Bilingualism*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Sankoff, David and Poplack, Shana
1979 "A formal grammar for code-switching". *Papers in Linguistics* 14: 3-46.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A.
1982 "Discourse as an interactional achievement: some uses of <uh huh> and other things that come between sentences". In *Analysing discourse: text and talk*, Tannen, D. (ed), 71-93. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Schütz, Alfred
1967[1962] *Collected papers I: The problem of social reality*. The Hague: Nijhoff.
- Schulze, Hagen.
1994 *Staat und Nation in der europäischen Geschichte*. München: Beck.
- Siguán, Miquel
1987 "Code switching and code mixing in the bilingual speaker: a cognitive approach". In *Devenir bilingue — parler bilingue*, G. Lüdi (ed), 211-224. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Stienen, Angela and Wolf, Manuela
1991 *Integration — Emanzipation: Ein Widerspruch*. Saarbrücken: Breitenbach.
- Strubell i Trueta, Miquel

- 1994 “Catalan in Valencia: the story of an attempted secession”. In *Sprachstandardisierung*, G. Lüdi (ed), 229-254. Freiburg: Universitätsverlag.
- Tabouret-Keller, Andrée
1987 “Parler créole, devenir créole: le cas complexe du district de Cayo, à Belize”. In *Devenir bilingue — parler bilingue*, Lüdi, Georges (ed), 227-241. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Tajfel, Henri and Turner, John C.
1979 “An integrative theory of intergroup conflict”. In *The social psychology of intergroup relations*, W.G. Austin and S. Worchel (eds), 33-47. Monterey, Calif.: Brooks/Cole Publ.
- Talmy, Leonard
1985 “Lexicalization patterns: semantic structure in lexical form”. In *Language typology and syntactic description III*, T. Shopen (ed), 51-149. New York: Cambridge University Press.
1995 “The relation of grammar to cognition”. In *Linguistique et modèles cognitifs*, G. Lüdi and Cl.-A. Zuber (eds), 139-173. Bâle: Institut des langues et littératures romanes/Sion, Institut universitaire Kurt Bösch [=Acta Romanica Basiliensia [ARBA], 3].
- Titone, Renzo
1987 “The psychological roots of code-switching”. In *Devenir bilingue — parler bilingue*, G. Lüdi (ed), 259-270. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Valdman, Albert (ed)
1979 *Le français hors de France*. Paris: Champion.
- Volterra, Virginia and Taeschner, Traute
1978 “The acquisition and development of language by bilingual children”. *Journal of Child Language* 5: 311-26.
- Vygotsky, Lev Semenovič
1978 *Mind in Society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wald, Paul
1986 “La diglossie immergée: représentations alternatives du répertoire linguistique chez les Yakoma de Bangui”. *Langages et société* 38: 51-67.
- Wattendorf, Elise and Birgit Westermann et al.
2001 “Different languages activate different subfields in Broca’s area”. *Neuroimage* 13, 624.
- Weltens, Bert, de Bot, Kees and van Els, Theo (eds)
1986 *Language attrition in progress*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Werlen, Iwar, Lieverscheidt, Esther, Wymann, Adrian and Zimmermann, Hansmartin
1992 «... mit denen reden wir nicht». *Schweigen und Reden im Quartier*. Basel: Helbing & Lichtenhahn.

Notes

- 1 This paper was first submitted to the editors of this volume for publication in December 2000. Its structure reflects the state of the discussion at this time. Invited by the editors to update our paper, we decided to focus more on the general topic of the volume, to add some references to recent research results and some relevant publications in the field, but to let the general argumentation untouched.

- 2 Defined with Tajfel as “that part of an individual’s self-concept which derives from his or her knowledge of his or her membership in a social group (or groups) together with the values and emotional significance attached to that membership” (Tajfel and Turner 1979).
- 3 Further evidence to this is added by the results of a study of social acceptance of deviant items in Neuchâtel (Switzerland). The informants had to classify the acceptance of unconventional expressions (conventional forms in brackets) in a informal oral situation on a scale going from 1 (unacceptable) to 7 (fully acceptable), indicating, at the same time, the reasons for an eventual rejection. The result was that the acceptance was systematically and significantly lower when the deviant element was (correctly or erroneously) categorised as a translinguistic marker (i.e. as an influence from German) rather than as regionalism, grammatical error etc.:

<i>Item</i>	<i>acceptance if categorised as Germanism</i>	<i>acceptance if not categorised as Germanism</i>
Il veut [va] pleuvoir It will rain.	2.4	2.8
Je voudrais le visiter [lui rendre visite] I'd like to pay him a visit.	2.0	4.1
Elle lui [l'] aide She helps him.	2.0	4.6
On a personne vu [On n'a vu personne] We didn't see anybody.	2.8	3.5

For detailed results see the contribution of Bernard Py in Lüdi/Py et al. 1994, 115ff.

- 4 We define *translinguistic wording* as a communicative strategy for getting oneself out of a predicament caused by limited lexical resources in L2; it consists in the conscious use of single words or longer sequences of L1 (or in any other language likely to be understood by the native speaker of L2) as a form of rescue- like in example (2).
- 5 Péronnet (1996) calls it “traditional Acadian French” (“français acadien traditionnel”) and acknowledges new borrowings from English as a line of development in the direction of a “non standard French”
- 6 Auer (1999) calls this type of translinguistic markers code-mixing“. Even if we refrain from adopting his terminology, we fully agree that there is an important difference between code-switching with global and local functions, but only on a semantic, not on a grammatical level.
- 7 “I conceive the linguistic system from the perspective of its use in interaction. In human evolution, the System Language emerges from its use, in a phylogenetic as well as in an ontogenetic

perspective. Language developed on a biological base, but always in the context of social interaction.”