

Poplack, Shana & Dion, Nathalie. 2011. Can borrowing and codeswitching be distinguished? Methods 14. University of Western Ontario. August.

Many theory-driven accounts of language mixing are based on the premise that all intrasentential manifestations of language contact are instantiations of the same process (e.g. Myers-Scotton 2002; Eliasson 1990). Some go so far as to claim that borrowing and codeswitching cannot be distinguished (Gardner-Chloros & Edwards 2004; Winford 2005, 2009; Johanson 1993). But empirical studies have shown that the former are subject to the grammar of the recipient language, while the latter retain that of the lexifier (e.g. Poplack & Meechan 1998; Torres Cacoullos & Travis 2010). Here we extend this line of inquiry to speakers' treatment of individual words in borrowing and codeswitching modes.

Rather than relying on theory-internal criteria, we divided a corpus of 38,000 English words in otherwise French discourse into two operational categories: *lone* English-origin (LEO) words, and English words occurring within multiword fragments (MWF) of English. Three comparative measures were applied: 1) distribution across parts of speech, 2) level of diffusion, and 3) degree of morphosyntactic integration of the *same* lexical type alone and in a MWF.

Results confirm that LEO words and words in MWF differ wildly. The latter are distributed across all parts of speech; the former consist disproportionately of nouns. Nearly half the MWF consist of function words vs. 1% of LEO words. 94% of LEO word types occur at different diffusion levels in MWF. But the most striking evidence comes from morphosyntactic integration of the *same* lexical type occurring in each instantiation. On five independent measures (adjective placement, determiner realization, gender marking, plural affixation, and verb conjugation), LEO words differed consistently from those in MWF.

Systematic quantitative analysis revealed massive qualitative differences in the treatment of the two classes of other-language item. Since the cohort of LEO words demonstrably constitutes the source for most borrowings, and the MWFs are uncontroversial codeswitches, we conclude that codeswitching and borrowing are *not* instantiations of the same process. Certain linguists may continue to claim it is impossible to tell them apart, but speakers clearly have no trouble doing so: they treat the *same* word differently in each context.

References:

- Eliasson, Stig. 1990. English-Maori language contact: Code-switching and the Free-Morpheme Constraint. *Languages in Contact: Proceedings of the Symposium 16.1 of the 12th International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences*. Zagreb: University of Zagreb. 33-49.
- Gardner-Chloros, Penelope & Edwards, Malcolm. 2004. Assumptions behind grammatical approaches to code-switching: when the blueprint is a red herring. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 102(1): 103-129.
- Johanson, Lars. 1993. Code-copying in Immigrant Turkish. In G. Extra & L. Verhoeven (eds.) *Immigrant Languages in Europe*, pp. 197-221. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Myers-Scotton, Carol. 2002. *Contact linguistics: Bilingual encounters and grammatical outcomes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Poplack, Shana & Meechan, Marjory (eds.). 1998. Instant loans, easy conditions: the productivity of bilingual borrowing. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 2(2) (Special issue).
- Torres Cacoullos, Rena, & Travis, Catherine E. Forthcoming, 2010. Variable *yo* expression in New Mexico: English influence? In S. Rivera-Mills & D. Villa (eds.), *Spanish of the Southwest: A language in transition*. Frankfurt: Iberoamericana/Vervuert.
- Winford, Donald. 2005. Contact-induced changes: Classification and processes. *Diachronica* 22(2): 373-427.
- Winford, Donald. 2009. On the unity of contact phenomena and their underlying mechanisms. In L. Isurin, D. Winford & K. de Bot (eds), *Multidisciplinary Approaches Code Switching*, pp. 279-305. Amsterdam: Benjamins.