

Yaron Matras

Repertoire management and the performative origin of Mixed Languages

1 Introduction

Mixed Languages (MLs) are usually defined in relation to their structural profile as well as the societal circumstances in which they emerge. Indicative structural profiles that have been associated with MLs include the split between the etymological sources of the bulk of the lexicon (including core lexicon) and grammar (grammatical inflection and clause structure), the split between the etymological sources of noun phrase and verb phrase grammars, as well as, more generally, the impression that the language resists straightforward language-genealogical classification (Matras and Bakker 2003; Thomason 2007; O'Shannessy 2020; Mazzoli & Sippola, this volume; Bakker, this volume). The latter usually rests on an implicit (rather than explicitly formulated) expectation that some structural admixtures are less likely to emerge through conventional processes of gradual contact-induced change, which are not regarded as interfering with continuity of classification. Whether or not the concept of structural borrowing can be applied to MLs is therefore controversial, a point to which I shall return below. More commonly, MLs are considered cases of broken transmission (Thomason & Kaufman 1988) where new languages emerge, though unlike pidgins and creoles there is greater equilibrium in the contribution of (at least) two source languages as well as continuation of grammatical inflection from at least one of those source languages and in some cases from both. Societal settings that have been associated with the birth of MLs include the emergence of new communities of ethnically mixed households, a process of acculturation while retaining community separateness in colonial settings, and the flagging of ethnic distinctness in itinerant or nomadic communities.

The precise factors that determine the link between these societal processes, and the structural outcomes that characterise MLs, remain subject to debate and speculation. A key issue is whether MLs should be regarded as a distinct language type that owes its existence to a distinctive communicative purpose; or

Acknowledgements: I am grateful to the volume editors, to an anonymous reviewer, and to Evangelia Adamou for valuable and helpful comments on an earlier version of this chapter.

Yaron Matras, University of Manchester, yaron.matras@manchester.ac.uk

<https://doi.org/10.1515/9781501511257-013>

whether MLs should instead be placed at the far end of a continuum of structural borrowing, where social conditions merely facilitate outcomes that appear more extensive or dense and which therefore blur genetic classification. If we opt for the latter – the idea that MLs occupy an extreme position on a continuum of structural borrowing – then the category of ‘ML’ is likely to remain somewhat impressionistic and vague, denoting a conspicuous structural outcome without necessarily following any indicative threshold of structural mixing beyond which a language can be classified as ‘ML’. Problematic in that regard is the fact that the notion of language-genetic classification rests on the assumption that some structures (notably inflectional paradigms and basic vocabulary) are less likely to be borrowed wholesale across languages and that therefore consistency in the source of inflectional paradigms, on the one hand, and of basic vocabulary, on the other, allows us to identify genetic classification, while inconsistency among the etymological sources of these structural components obscures such classification. Thus, if MLs are defined primarily through the fact that they resist straightforward genetic classification, then by implication they must be treated as idioms that contradict expectations on borrowing rather than as examples of extreme forms of borrowing. If, by contrast, we follow the former notion – the idea that MLs are qualitatively distinct from cases of borrowing – then we require a definition of the structural profile (or prototype) that would allow us to distinguish MLs from cases of contact-induced change that are not MLs. For an explanatory model we would also require an exposition of the link between such profile and the distinctive social settings that give rise to the ML language type.

In this chapter I argue that MLs should be treated as a distinct language type that is not situated at the far end of a continuum of structural borrowing. I begin by reviewing what we know so far about that continuum and the typical scope of structural borrowing, and argue that it can be explained in terms of users’ motivations to manage their bilingual repertoire across an array of different though conventional communication routines. Next, I briefly review the kind of structural outcomes that have been associated with MLs and offer a structural definition of the ML prototype, one that distinguishes it from borrowing. Note that I will reserve the term ‘borrowing’ for cases of contact-induced language change that do not fall under the ML prototype and I will not use that term to account for processes that lead to the formation of MLs (while recognizing that MLs, once formed, can of course come into contact with other languages and borrow from those in the normal way, as in the case of Michif, a French-Cree mixture, which is now in contact with English). I then turn to an explanatory model of the emergence of the ML prototype. Following up on tentative suggestions that MLs are the product of deliberate speech manipulation or structural moulding, I propose that MLs arise from the conventionalisation

of performative speech acts. I argue that the performative effect is achieved by explicitly defying the conventions on language mixing (or everyday repertoire management in bilingual settings), giving rise to mixed utterances that stand out even in an environment that is already accustomed to language mixing. In that way, in addition to their content and illocutionary force, such utterances function as actions in their own right: They convey a message pertaining to social relations and bonding, enabling speakers to construct and reinforce a new identity and project and reaffirm a newly-shaped sense of belonging. The conventionalisation of such utterances may lead ultimately to a neutralisation of the performative function and to a ‘normalisation’ of the ML as an all-purpose mode of speech, though such cases are relatively rare and almost all attested MLs appear to retain at least some residual performativity and carry accordingly a very distinctive indexical meaning within users’ multilingual repertoire.

Since the performative effect is achieved at the emergence stage through a communication routine that defies conventional patterns of language mixing, the structural outcome (once conventionalised) is distinct from patterns of borrowing that arise from everyday mixed utterances that are not explicitly performative but driven by other factors. My argument is thus that MLs arise from a particular form of communicative routine that is associated with the social settings named above, where identity is re-negotiated, typically in small population groups that are undergoing some form of socio-cultural transition. The performative nature of that communicative routine accounts for the kinds of structural mixture that stand out as exceptional, indeed as defying expectations and general observations on the outcomes of structural borrowing encountered in other settings. In the final section I briefly survey the case studies presented in this volume and discuss their relation to my hypotheses about the borrowing of structural categories, exceptionality, and the role of performativity in ML formation.

2 Repertoire management and motivations for borrowing

In this section I outline a functional model of contact-induced change that is anchored in an understanding of discourse interaction as the site of contact (for a full discussion see Matras 2020). Individuals have at their disposal a wholesale, integrated repertoire of linguistic resources. Experimental evidence suggests that the repertoire is not inherently compartmentalised by languages in the sense that bilinguals can activate or de-activate a ‘language’ on a wholesale basis (cf. Bialystok et al. 2009). Instead, the selection of items or features and sets of features from the

repertoire for use in a given interaction, and the de-selection or inhibition of others, is an activity in which users of language constantly engage. Communication in multilingual settings can be seen as impacted by three distinct pull factors:

The first is the need to accommodate to the expectations of the setting or interlocutor by selecting those elements from the repertoire that are admissible, understandable, and thus purposeful in that particular setting or context, and de-selecting or inhibiting those that are not. I will call this the ‘accommodation’ factor, merely for the sake of referencing. That is what we mean by ‘choosing the correct language’ in an interaction context. The skill to do this relies on the ability to exercise mental control over selection and inhibition of structural elements from the repertoire by activating the executive control mechanism (Green 1998; Bialystok 2015). Effective control over selection and inhibition is subject to a variety of factors including social and sociolinguistic competence (which is gradually acquired in the early years of linguistic socialisation) but also cognitive factors such as distractions or interactional tension as well as pathological factors such as memory lapses, fatigue, injuries and so on.

The second pull factor is the urge to exploit the full expressive potential of the linguistic repertoire. This factor competes with the first – the accommodation factor – when repertoire items are deemed to be functional but do not meet the expectations of the interaction setting or context (i.e. they are not in the selected ‘language’). Speakers exercise their judgement whether, in such cases, to override such constraints. In what Grosjean (2001) has termed the ‘bilingual mode’ speakers will more frequently override such inhibitions, and indeed there may be little or no friction between the two pull factors as all elements of the repertoire may equally be admissible. Where stricter constraints on accommodation apply, speakers may prioritise certain elements for de-inhibition, such as ‘unique referents’ (Matras 2020) or lexical items marked by ‘specificity’ (Backus 1996) that lack translatable equivalents (such as terms for institutions or procedures, or culture-specific items).

The final pull factor is what I call load reduction. Effective management of the discourse may compete with the effective management of (that part of) the executive control mechanism that regulates selection and inhibition of elements from the repertoire. Competition among items of similar meaning may be most pronounced where discourse management tasks require particularly high concentration or intensive processing and thus impose a high cognitive load on the speaker.¹ A pertinent indicator of high cognitive load is the apparent frequency of language selection errors or bilingual slips of the tongue showing

¹ For recent work using Event-Related Potential (ERP) experiments to measure processing cost in the comprehension (rather than production) of discourse markers see Rasenberg et al. (2020).

'loss of control' around such items, and the link to high susceptibility to long-term borrowing (see Matras 1998, 2000a): Speakers are more likely to show lapses in effective selection and inhibition around items that monitor and direct the listener's processing of content, and which anticipate gaps in shared presuppositional knowledge. Tasks of this kind typically involve language-processing operations where there is a potential clash of expectations or inferences between the speaker and the listener and therefore a risk to efficient and harmonious communication. They include, for instance, the linking of propositional units, processing unexpected or non-confirmed and non-presuppositional propositions such as those marked by contrast, discontinuity, modality, or indefiniteness ('somebody', 'anywhere', etc.), and general procedures of monitoring and directing turn structure. Generalising just a single item or set of items for a particular function can eliminate the need to choose between 'languages' around that functional operation and with it the need to engage the executive control in selection and inhibition. That reduces the cognitive load. Load reduction, like exploitation of expressive potential, can occur locally on a one-off basis (often unintentionally, as in bilingual slips or choice of 'wrong' language for the right item, which can be subject to self-repair), or be replicated and perpetuated, leading to long term change of communicative routines, i.e. eliminating the need to choose among items of equivalent or near-equivalent functions according to 'language' context; that is what we commonly call structural or grammatical borrowing. In Matras (1998) I coined the term 'fusion' to capture the non-separation of labelled languages around an entire set of operators for a particular operational domain (such as conjunctions, discourse markers, indefinites, aktionsart affixes, modals, and so on) and demonstrated that there is a link between one-off speech production errors involving such items, regularisation of 'mixing' involving the same, and long term structural change or borrowing. Load reduction, then, in a nutshell, is the use of only one item to reduce cognitive work needed to choose among different items of similar or equivalent function. Replication of the same process and its propagation among the community of speakers will lead to long-term language change where the item from one language is replaced by its equivalent from another. Invariably, the item that prevails is the one that is acceptable to the community of speakers, the one that carries with it fewest constraints on intelligibility in various interaction settings, and the one belonging to the language that enjoys greater power. When bilingualism is unidirectional, as with many minority languages, borrowing in such cases always targets the majority language.

Note that pull factors may interact and overlap. The generalisation of a word across the multilingual speaker's range of interaction settings – the borrowing of a lexical item from one language into another – allows the speaker to make use of the full expressive potential of the repertoire without regard to the

constraints on accommodation toward setting or interlocutor, while at the same time eliminating the need to select between competing items of the same meaning. Load reduction is driven by the urge to ease processing and eliminate the need to select among competing forms with the same or similar function, while also resulting in a single expressive grid around certain functions or classes of functions. The difference between the two pull-factors is the initial trigger, with the first motivated by the need to equalise expressive means while the second aims to level differences in form.

Social conventions and relations among potential interlocutors dictate the extent to which selection and inhibition from the repertoire is strict or consistent. Taken in this perspective, contact-induced language change is the product of lines being re-drawn, as multilingual speakers balance the three pull factors in new ways around individual meanings and functions, giving rise to innovative usages. In extreme scenarios, some factors may override others: The ultimate drive toward full exploitation of the expressive potential would lead in theory to a completely random selection from the repertoire that is not governed by accommodation constraints. This would be the consistent bilingual mode, more recently understood as a ‘translanguaging’, ‘heterolinguistic’ or ‘metrolinguistic’ scenario that hesitates to distinguish language boundaries in practical usage yet acknowledges the presence of socially constructed, prescriptive notions of language separateness (cf. Jørgensen 2008, Blommaert & Backus 2013, Li Wei 2018, Pennycook & Otsuji 2015). The emergence of pidgins and creoles might be seen as a process by which users avail themselves of all features that are readily accessible in a shared feature pool of the surrounding language ecology (cf. Mufwene 2013), accommodation yielding to expressive potential rather than guided by pre-set considerations of well-formedness. By contrast, ultimate load-reduction would mean the complete abandonment of dual or multiple language options, resulting in effect in language shift and the abandonment of one of the languages.² Where load reduction is so prevalent that it exempts entire categories from accommodation-based selection constraints, the languages in effect fuse or converge wholesale around a number of functional categories.

The cumulative effect of these various motivations is well illustrated in languages that have experienced situations of intense contact, in particular where one language is socially, economically or politically dominant and where active

² Of course, even within a ‘language’ there are always stylistic variants, which are subject to selection and inhibition in a way that is similar to the management of multilingual repertoires.

bilingualism is widespread and often unidirectional. Consider the case of Nova Scotia Acadian French:

- (1) Nova Scotia Acadian French (YouTube recording by Anna Pottier, published on Nov 8, 2008; available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WUrbdLnPkmE>; last accessed 09.08.2018)
Well, chais-pas comment *useful* que ça/ ça va être, *but*, uhm, c'est pour parler en acadien, parce que i ny'a *no-one around* avec qui ce que je peux parler, so, je vas juste faire cett-i *recording* et *who knows*, quelque *someone* va me répondre *back*, *you know*, juste pour dire *Hi or something*, parce que, c'est comme ça que je parle/ qu'on parle chez nous, *which* que de Nova Scotia, et *I hope* que je vas *mover* à Austin Texas *which* qu'est *really* proche de Louisiana, est-ce le monde là bas/ *well* c'est mon monde *really*, *I mean*, quand que j'écoutes cela radio KB101 ah/ Louisiana Proud, des fois j'écoutes ce *radio station* là, *even though* qu'ils avoient un différent *accent* comme moi, ils sont comme [] chez nous. *So*, ça sera *really nice*, ah *especially* j'aurais vous dire, *sorry*, j'aurais vous dire de Ménard, *really really nice*, je *watch* ça passe en chante dans son Youtube, il est *really good*, moi j'*enjoy* ça beaucoup.

The community is bilingual in Acadian French and in English. The use of particular English expressions is a permanent feature of this local style of Nova Scotia regional French. At a superficial glance the passage might be perceived as a random 'mixture' of French and English. At closer examination we can note that the diffusion of English loans across functional categories follows certain patterns. First, we find elements that belong to the class of discourse markers, fillers, conjunctions, focus particles and interjections: *well*, *but*, *even though*, *especially*, *sorry*. An extension of the same category are the expressions *who knows*, *you know*, *I mean*. They take the overt form of conjugated verbs accompanied by pronouns, and from a strictly formal perspective they might be viewed as short phrase insertions, or 'EL islands' in Myers-Scotton's (1993) terminology. However, from a functional perspective they act as self-contained fillers that allow the speaker to monitor and direct listener-sided participation (see Matras 1998). We are therefore not looking in such cases at the borrowing of English pronouns and inflected verbs but rather at the wholesale adoption of entire expressions.

Loosely related to the same category are the relativiser *which* (doubled in the expression *which que*), which initiates a procedure of information supplementation, and the utterance level modifiers *really*, *really nice*, *really good*; the latter are lexical content items that constitute discrete illocutionary units that

convey an exclamatory evaluation of entire propositions. We then find the indefinite expressions *no-one*, *someone*, *something*, and the verbal augments *around*, *back* (which might be classified as aktionsart modifiers). A series of content-lexical borrowings includes the adjective *useful*, the nouns *accent*, *radio station*, and the integrated verbs *je watch*, *j'enjoy*, *mover*. Finally, there is one single example of the borrowing of a verb along with its inflection (in the form of the proclitic English pronoun), in the modal verb *I hope*. In regard to some of the categories identified above, a case can be made for the wholesale adoption of certain functional categories from English, or 'fusion'. However, with the exception of the modal *I hope*, there is no evidence of language mixing at the level of inflectional material. The modal *I hope* is a case in point: Here, I argue, the motivation to reduce processing load leads to a fusion (elimination of competing equivalent expressions) around a modal expression. That in turn carries with it as a kind of side effect the importation of English-derived inflection (manifested in this case through the use of the English proclitic *I*). We cannot, therefore, speak of borrowing of English verb inflection as such, and indeed we find other English-derived verbs – lexical content verbs, not modals – in this example that are integrated into French verb inflection. So the point here is that while there is no general motivation to borrow English verb inflection, such borrowing of English verb inflection accompanies the borrowing of an English modal verb, motivated by the search for load reduction around the production of modals. I shall return to some similar examples below.

Consider now an example from Domari, an Indo-Aryan language of the Middle East, as spoken in Jerusalem, a variety that was moribund in the 1990s and has since become all but extinct (Matras 2012). Here, structural borrowing from the contiguous dialect of Arabic appears in each and every utterance:

- (2) Jerusalem Domari (from Matras 2012; Arabic-derived elements are italicised):
- a. *Lamma kunt* ama qašṭōṭ-ik, na nēr-ded-im
when was.1SG I small-PRED.F.SG NEG send-PERF-3PL
madāris-an-ka.
schools-PL.OBL-DAT
 - b. *ū baqēt* kury-a-ma *zayy xaddām-ēk*
and stayed.1SG house.-F.SG.OBL-LOC like servant-PRED.F.SG
 - c. *ū daʕīman yaʕnī kunt* ama kury-a-m-ēk
and always that.is was.1SG I house-F.SG.OBL-LOC-PRED.F.SG
 - d. *wala* kil-šam-i *wala* aw-am-i
and.not exit-1.SG-PRES and.not come-1SG-PRES

- e. *wala* *waddi-ka-d-m-i* *maḥall-ak*.
 and.not bring-LOAN.TR-3PL-1SG-PRES place-INDEF
 a. *When I was small, they didn't send me to [any] school.*
 b. *And [so] I stayed at home like a servant*
 c. *And I was always I mean at home,*
 d. *not going out nor coming,*
 e. *nor do they take me anywhere.*

Arabic borrowings cover all conjunctions (e.g. *lamma* 'when', *ū* 'and', *wala* 'neither . . . nor'), most prepositions (e.g. *zayy* 'like'), most indefinite expressions (*daʔīman* 'always', *maḥall-* 'some-where'), fillers (*yaʔnī* 'that is'), as well as modal and aspectual auxiliaries, which also carry Arabic inflection (*kunt* 'I was', *baqēt* 'I remained').³ Note that otherwise verb and nominal inflection belong consistently to the inherited Indo-Aryan component. We thus find a pattern that is somewhat similar to the Acadian French examples, where lexical verbs are integrated into French inflection but the English modal *I hope* carries its English inflection (such as it is).

We do not find a lexicon-grammar split in either Nova Scotia Acadian French, or in Jerusalem Domari. Nor is there a consistent split between the sources of nominal and verbal grammar, or any consistent split between the source language of the finite predication grammar and that of the core lexicon or major deictic categories (demonstratives and personal pronouns) that would match the profile that is typically associated with MLs (see below). Instead what we find in both cases is a tendency toward wholesale borrowing from the surrounding majority language of categories that help organise the discourse at the level of turn taking and clause combining, those that highlight gaps in presuppositions (e.g. indefinites), expressions of modality and modal auxiliaries, some expressions of local relations (metaphorical aktionsart modifiers in Acadian French, prepositions in Domari) as well as various lexical items, most of them arguably non-core. The density of borrowed items and their distribution across a range of functional categories might qualify as 'heavy' borrowing if we are to set a quantitative measure in terms of relative number of borrowed items and the number of distinct categories that absorb borrowing, as well as the tendency toward wholesale adoption of categories, or fusion. Note again that in both cases all speakers are bilingual and have active command of the respective

³ Both these verbs are used primarily as modals auxiliaries that modify other verbs (assigning remoteness tense, and iterativity, respectively) though here they modify a Domari nominal predication and are therefore rendered in the translation as lexical verbs.

contact language, English and Arabic, and bilingualism in the relevant communities tends to be unidirectional (most Anglophones in Nova Scotia do not learn Acadian French, though they study Standard French as a school subject; and no Arabic speakers learn Domari beyond just a handful of expressions).

We should at this point revisit the question whether there are any limitations on borrowing. Since Whitney (1881), studies of language contact have been postulating different kinds of generalisations on structural borrowing. Thomason & Kaufman's (1988) frequently cited borrowing hierarchy links the extent of borrowing to the duration and intensity of cultural contacts. It identifies structural categories that are more and less likely to require more intense contact in order to be subjected to borrowing, but it does not attempt to offer an explanation for the links between category function and ease of borrowing. Instead, the point is to show that no structure is completely immune to borrowing and that given sufficient intensity of contact, borrowing can bring about significant structural change. Campbell (1993) embarks on a similar argument. Surveying proposed constraints in detail, he shows that virtually none are absolute. Consequently, he concludes along with Thomason & Kaufman (1988) that proposed generalisations must be seen as tendencies rather than absolute constraints that categorically rule out the possibility of borrowing of particular structures.

In a way, this cautious approach toward constraints runs open doors: It treats 'constraint' as a limitation rather than a facilitating factor. In the functionalist oriented typological tradition, generalisations on borrowing have been presented as implicational hierarchies in an effort to identify a link between inherent properties of categories and their susceptibility to borrowing, introducing an element of causality and thereby an explanatory dimension into our understanding of structural borrowing. In her pioneering work in this area, Moravcsik (1978) identifies referential autonomy and semantic transparency as properties that facilitate borrowing, predicting the higher borrowability of lexical over non-lexical features, of nouns over other word classes, of free morphemes over bound ones and of derivation over inflection (see also Field 2002). Recent studies devoted to morphological borrowing (Gardani et al. 2015; Otsuka et al. 2012) have on the whole confirmed that while the borrowing of derivational morphemes is frequent, that of inflectional markers such as person, tense, or case is much more exceptional.

In the domain of lexicon, comparative studies (cf. Haspelmath and Tadmor 2009) have shown that activity domains that are more prone to the influence of external practice routine, such as the organisation of formal institutions and commerce, religion and belief, or fashion and domestic equipment, are also more prone to lexical borrowing than those that are stable, close and intimate, such as spatial relations, the body, and sense and perception. That gives an

empirical foundation to the notion represented for many years by the Swadesh list of ‘basic vocabulary’ taken to represent words that are less likely to be borrowed across languages and therefore might serve as a reliable indicator of language-genetic relatedness. Haspelmath and Tadmor’s ‘Leipzig-Jakarta List’ of basic vocabulary derived from the compilation of studies actually bears close similarities to the Swadesh list of just over two hundred lexical items.

The same kind of semantic hierarchy (close/intimate vs remote/formal) can also be represented within individual word categories: Borrowed kin terms are more likely to be designations for those who are less closely related, less frequently mentioned, and more likely to be named in the context of formal titles and genealogical inventories (e.g. English *uncle*, *aunt*, *grandparents*, *niece*, *nephew*, all from French; Maltese *nannu* ‘grandfather’, *ziju* ‘uncle’, *kuġin* ‘cousin’, *neputi* ‘nephew’ from Italian/Sicilian) (cf. Matras 2020: 183–184). Languages that borrow numerals, such as Swahili and Domari (both from Arabic) and Romani (from Greek) are more likely to borrow numerals above than under ‘5’. The proneness to borrowing of higher numerals (as well as those associated strictly with formal mathematical routines rather than with everyday counting, namely ‘zero’ and fractions) reflects their association with non-casual, institutional procedures and transactions and therefore with the language that dominates such routines (see also Williams-Van Klinken and Hajek’s (2018) study of the distribution of indigenous, Indonesian and Portuguese numerals in Tetun Dili). In both cases, everyday concepts that are simple, close, intimate, and more frequently used tend to be more resistant to borrowing whereas their paradigm counterparts that indicate greater complexity, remoteness, formality and tightly regulated routines are more borrowing-prone.

The few studies that have considered the borrowing of grammatical categories across language samples (cf. Stolz & Stolz 1996; Matras 1998; Elšík & Matras 2006; Matras 2007) together paint a fairly consistent picture of implicational hierarchies at the top of which are the highly borrowable semantic-pragmatic meanings such as contrast, subjunctive modality and conditionality, obligation and necessity, exceptionality and superlatives, and the structural categories that express them, namely conjunctions, discourse and focus particles, phasal adverbs (adverbs of change and continuation), indefinites, expressions of peripheral relations and metaphorical spatial relations (verbal augments or particles and actionsart modifiers), to name but some. The different degrees of susceptibility to contact of such categories have been confirmed by other studies devoted to single contact situations even when emphasising the lack of absolute predictive power and the need to take into consideration particular structural-typological constraints (e.g. Melissaropoulou and Ralli 2019).

On the whole, then, borrowing appears to be driven by motivations of repertoire management as described above in relation to the three pull factors: The desire to maximise expressive potential (in the lexical domain as well as in nuanced semantic distinctions such as *aktionsart*) and to reduce processing load by allowing the fusion or partial fusion of structural categories around those functions that place a high demand on the management of interaction, clashes with presuppositions, unexpected inferences, and the chaining of propositions. Those are balanced against speakers' determination to manifest accommodation to context, setting, interlocutor and so on through the choice of what is perceived to be the appropriate 'language', meaning in the multilingual setting that there is a motivation for language maintenance and toward resisting language shift, hence the modifications to communication routines that we perceive as contact-induced structural change or borrowing.

While structures or individual items that belong to core lexicon, finite predication grammar, nominal inflection or personal pronouns are not categorically exempted from borrowing, there are, for the reasons explained above, comparatively few cases in which borrowing is attested in these domains. In other words, borrowing of finite inflection markers, of nominal case markers, and of entire sets of personal pronouns and demonstratives is relatively rare. I propose that this is not the product of a constraint as such but rather of the absence, relatively speaking, of a motivation to borrow in these functional domains. Taken from a semantic-pragmatic perspective, inflectional markers of person, tense, and nominal case (so-called contextual inflection) provide a system of navigating the relations between entities in an utterance that are derived from a presupposed, shared mapping of roles and perspectives (shared between speaker and listener, that is). Similarly, deictic and anaphoric expressions (demonstrative and personal pronouns) equally navigate a shared reference space that is either physically present or imagined through the shared verbalised context. In both cases – contextual inflection, and indexical expressions – we therefore do not find the typical prompts for load reduction, namely the need to navigate potential gaps and discrepancies between speaker's and listener's expectations and presupposed mapping of knowledge and information. Nor do we find the content-lexical drive to maximise expressive potential (though of course semantic categorisation of the real world is prone to convergence or pattern replication, and we find analogous re-mapping of semantic case, tense-aspect categories, inclusive-exclusive distinctions in pronouns, and so on, proving that where motivations for the borrowing of form-function mapping arise, such structural categories are not principally immune to contact-induced change). So what 'protects' inflectional paradigms and sets of demonstratives and personal pronouns, as well as core vocabulary, by and large, from direct

borrowing (replication of matter, rather than pattern) is not an exemption constraint as such but rather the absence, relatively speaking, of motivation for borrowing.

The exceptions that prove the rule are cases where local motivations arise. Examples of the borrowing of nominal case markers have been documented by Heath (1984) for languages of Arnhem Land and appear to be part of a larger scale diffusion of nominal properties that include derivation markers and classifiers, but the background of social contacts is not well understood. Thomason and Everett (2001) make the case for the borrowability of personal pronouns but rely in their examples in part on cases of MLs (Chavacano and Mednyj Aleut), making the argument in effect circular (because, as alluded to above, if we accept that MLs are a distinct type of language because they defy generalisations on contact-induced structural change then we cannot at the same time use them to exemplify generalisations on contact-induced structural change). Their other examples are cases already discussed by Wallace (1983) for Southeast Asian languages. But in those, the relevant items generally function as lexicalised honorifics rather than deictic and anaphoric forms (somewhat comparable to English ‘Majesty’ or ‘Excellency’) (cf. Ho-Dac 2002; Tadmor 2004). In terms of motivations, they fall under lexical items that label culture-specific social relations, including titles and terms of address. Direct borrowing of concrete morphological forms of definite articles (as opposed to the pattern replication of articles drawing on inherited material) is rare, but Algerian Arabic makes use of the French definite article with some borrowed French nouns as a marker of plurality: Thus *riṣṭūra*, pl. *riṣṭurāt* ‘restaurant(s)’, *šumbra*, pl. *šnāber* ‘room(s)’, but *kādu*, pl. *likādu* ‘present(s)’, *ʔami*, pl. *lizami* ‘friend(s)’.

In a number of Romani dialects, the borrowing of plural markers that also indicate plurality on pronouns coupled with the coincidental similarity between the inherited Romani third person pronouns SG. *ov* PL. *on* and those of the respective contact languages has brought about analogous formations of third person plural pronouns, as in Hungarian Romani *on-k* ‘they’ (Hungarian *ők*), Croatian Romani *on-i* (Croatian *oni*), and Bulgarian (Kalburdžu and Xoraxane) Romani *on-nar* (Turkish *onlar*). By a similar analogy to Turkish, drawing on the coincidental similarity between the first and second person singular markers *-m* and *-n* respectively, some Bulgarian dialects of Romani adopt the plural formation for past-tense first and second person inflection from Turkish: 1PL *-amis* (Turkish *-VmVz*) 2PL *-enis* (Turkish *-VnVz*). In both cases, local motivations (here: formal analogy) drive the development leading to borrowing in a domain that is otherwise not prone to the re-drawing of boundaries. Pakendorf (2015) reports on the borrowing of modality paradigms (necessitative and assertive moods) from Sakha or Yakut (Turkic) to Éven (Tungusic), two Siberian languages.

Here, the drive would appear to be toward fusion of procedures of mapping modality, triggered by the load reduction pull factor. That also accounts for the adoption into Domari of Arabic auxiliary verbs and modal expressions inclusive of their Arabic person inflection, discussed above and illustrated further by the following examples:

Jerusalem Domari (Arabic derived items italicised):

- (3) ama *bidd-ī* dža-m kurya-ta
 I want-1SG go-1SG house-DAT
 ‘I want to go home’
- (4) putr-or *ḡall-o* fumn-ar-i ben-im
 son-2SG remain-3SG.M hit-3SG-PRG sister-1SG.OBL
 ‘Your son keeps beating my sister.’
- (5) *ṣār-u* fēr-and-i *baṣḡ baṣḡ-ē-san* waṭ-an-ma
 began-3PL hit-3PL-PRG REFL REFL-PL-3PL stone-OBL.PL-LOC
 ‘They started to throw stones at one another’

The Arabic person-agreement markers 1SG *-ī*, 3SG.M *-o*, and 3PL *-u* accompany the nominal modal expressions *bidd-* ‘want’ and *ḡall-* ‘keep’ and the verb *ṣār-* ‘to begin’, respectively. Their antecedents are all part of the Domari utterance or conversation context. The wholesale borrowing of Arabic modal and auxiliary expressions also extends to the markers of continuation and habituality, demonstrated in (2), which use the inflected Arabic forms *baḡē-t* ‘I stayed/ continued to’ and *kun-t* ‘I was/ I used to’ respectively.

A number of Romani dialects show alternation of finite predication grammar with lexical verbs, as borrowed verbs may retain their source language inflection. The Romani dialect of Parakalamos in Epirus in northwestern Greece shows an incipient tendency toward such compartmentalisation in the domain of lexical verbs (Matras 2015):

- (6) Parakalamos Romani (Greek-derived items are italicised):
 na *bor-o* te *diavaz-o* soske *prepi* te
 NEG can-1SG COMP study-1SG because must COMP
vojt-iz-av me *daj-a*
 help-LOAN-1SG my.OBL mother-OBL
 ‘I cannot study because I have to help my mother’

As in the above examples from Domari, modal expressions borrowed from the contact language Greek retain their source language inflection: *bor-o* ‘I can’, *prep-i* (impersonal 3SG) ‘it is necessary’. Some Greek loan verbs are adapted and carry Romani person and tense inflection: *vojt-iz-av* ‘I help’. Others however appear in their Greek inflected form: *diavaz-o* ‘I study (read)’. A similar incipient tendency has been observed in Romani dialects of Russia while in some Romani dialects of the Balkans the retention of Turkish inflection with Turkish loan verbs is the norm (see Adamou, this volume; and Adamou 2010). Viewed in terms of the repertoire management strategies discussed above, example (6) shows a variety of different operations: Modal verbs undergo fusion under the load reduction pull factor and that entails their complete replication inclusive of Greek person inflection. Adapted (morphologically integrated) Greek lexical verbs serve to exhaust expressive potential, which is balanced against the accommodation factor. The replication of Greek inflection with Greek lexical verbs indicates the weakening of accommodation as an active pull factor that exerts pressure on speakers to control repertoire features by inhibiting finite predication grammar that is associated with the de-selected language (Greek); such inhibition is relaxed and is apparently not deemed an essential property of accommodation. In effect, the constraints on selection and inhibition which make accommodation possible may be said to retreat to some extent, as features of finite predication grammar are allowed to accompany lexical verbs with which they co-occur in Greek-speaking interaction contexts. The retention of Greek inflection exclusively with (some) Greek-derived verbs resembles the compartmentalisation in the verbal system exhibited by Romani dialects that carry over inflected Turkish verbs (Adamou, this volume; Adamou and Shen 2019). However, there is no evidence so far, to my knowledge, in either case, of diffusion of the borrowed inflection paradigms into inherited Romani verbs.

To summarise, while there does not seem to be any absolute constraint that categorically rules out the borrowing of nominal inflection markers, personal pronouns and demonstratives, definite articles, or finite inflection on the verb, forms belonging to these and some other categories are not frequently borrowed because the pull factors that guide repertoire management in multilingual settings do not generally give rise to a motivation to borrow them. Exceptions are the product of particular circumstances, such as analogies based on coincidental structural similarities, or accompanying by-products of other borrowing motivations such as those that apply to the adoption of cultural routines around honorific titles or to load reduction around markers of modality. When finite predication grammar is borrowed along with borrowed lexical verbs, as in the Romani examples cited, it expresses a partial retreat of the accommodation factor, yielding to the fact that the particular inflection pattern usually co-occurs with particular lexical verbs

when interacting in the (non-Romani) contact language. But such feature co-occurrence irrespective of language choice in the utterance remains distinct from the processes that appear to have given rise to MLs, as we see neither diffusion of borrowed verb inflection to inherited (non-borrowed) verbs, nor a complete replacement of inherited verbs by borrowed verbs along with their borrowed inflection. In short, it is difficult to identify any evidence for a continuum between the processes that give rise to borrowing as the outcome of balancing acts of the pull factors associated with repertoire management as described above, even far-reaching ones, and the structural outcomes that characterise MLs, namely different sources for grammar and lexicon, or different sources for key inflectional paradigms (verbal and nominal), or different sources for grammatical inflection and entire pronominal paradigms. I discuss this ML ‘prototype’ in the next section.

3 The ML prototype

Prevailing hypotheses explain MLs as emerging abruptly through pre-determined compartmentalisation of structural material from (usually) two languages in single utterances (Bakker 1997); or alternatively as a conventionalisation of code-mixing patterns at the utterance level (see Backus 2003); or as the extreme point of a continuum between code-mixing, heavy borrowing (sometimes captured by the notion of ‘fused lect’; see Auer 1999)⁴ and MLs. Bakker (1997) regards Michif as evidence for the abruptness of the process, while Meakins (2011) offers Gurindji Kriol as an example of a ML formation process that is gradual and emerges across several generations. In Matras (2000b) I proposed a distinction between the processes of ‘lexical re-orientation’ and ‘selective replication’ to capture the direction of change in relation to the source of finite predication grammar. The first, ‘lexical re-orientation’, applies to cases where a community of speakers adopts core lexicon (possibly accompanied by grammatical features) from another language while retaining more or less intact the finite predication grammar

⁴ Auer’s (1999) term ‘fused lect’ has been widely cited as a transitional stage between code-mixing and MLs (see also Adamou, this volume). Auer’s example of a ‘fused lect’, however, is Sinti Romani, which borrows heavily from German in the rather predictable domains of lexicon, conjunctions and particles, as well as some instances of negation and verb modification (aktionsart) particles, prepositions and interrogatives. Since speakers are bilingual, the full inventory of German features is constantly available in Sinti Romani for spontaneous mixing as well. Auer does not, however, set any clear threshold for what might constitute a dense inventory of structural borrowing and codemixing on the one hand, and a ‘fused lect’ on the other, and so it is not clear how these concepts form a continuum.

of a separate, foundation language. The second, ‘selective replication’, captures shift across generations in the language of finite predication grammar while other structural components are retained from an earlier (‘ancestral’) language. Both processes thus involve a degree of language shift or interrupted transmission across generations (see also Sasse 1992; Myers-Scotton 1998, 2003). In cases of communities with mixed households, finite predication grammar may be retained from the language of the indigenous mothers, as in Michif (Cree verb grammar), or shift to the language of male colonial settlers, as in Mednyj Aleut (Russian finite verb inflection). In cases of contact with a surrounding majority or colonial language, finite predication grammar is either retained, as in Media Lengua (Quechua predication grammar), or shifts to that of the contact language, as in Gurindji Kriol (Kriol verb formation). The distinctive speech varieties of itinerant or nomadic populations by contrast are characterised invariably by symbiosis (Smith 1995) of their finite predication grammar with that of the surrounding majority language, usually characterised primarily by group-internal or even camouflage lexicon akin to that of cryptolects (see Matras 2010: 20–26).

While the precise composition of core lexicon, non-finite and nominal inflection, and grammatical lexicon is difficult to predict, varieties that have so far been labelled MLs all show just one source language for finite predication grammar; we have no attestation of an ML that derives its past-tense inflection, say, from one language, and its present tense inflection paradigm from another, or that splits singular person inflection on the verb from plural inflection, and so on. In Matras (2003) I therefore defined the ML prototype as consisting of finite predication grammar from one language (which I abbreviated ‘INFL’ with reference specifically to finite verb inflection rather than grammatical inflection in general) while showing any one or more of several components from a different source language that are rarely encountered as wholesale borrowings in cases of gradual contact-induced change: core lexicon, non-finite and nominal inflection paradigms, and complete sets of (rather than the odd) personal and interrogative pronouns, demonstratives and articles. These exceptional features of MLs have been linked to the circumstances of their emergence and societal attitudes to language and identity: MLs have been described as acts of identity that symbolise community separateness (Croft 2003; O’Shannessy 2020; Mazzoli and Sippola, this volume). Yet at the same time they have also been cited by some as evidence that contact-induced language change is less predictable than one might assume and that there are few if any constraints on the borrowing of structural categories (see Thomason 2015; Seifart 2017). As I suggested above, however, there appears to be an inherent contradiction between the view that MLs show exceptional profiles due to exceptional societal circumstances, and the idea that MLs should prompt us to re-assess the predictability of contact-induced language change in conventional settings.

I take the view that MLs are fundamentally different from borrowing. For a start, lexical re-orientation typically targets, as it does in cryptolects, everyday core lexicon rather than the kind of items that typically fall under exhausting expressive potential. Angloromani is widely cited as an ML with a lexicon-grammar split; examples in the literature, however, are usually based on an idealised desktop construction of sentences (e.g. Velupillai 2015: 72, citing Hancock 1992). In fact, Angloromani speech very seldom appears in the form of entire sentences, let alone entire stretches of conversation in which all lexical words derive from Romani. Documentation of actual in-group interaction (Matras 2010) shows that what English Gypsies⁵ perceive and label as ‘Romany’ or ‘English Romany’ or sometimes ‘English Romanes’ in fact consists of just a casual embedding into English speech of Romani-derived vocabulary. Such insertions may cover basic concepts and may be used in high density in some segments of speech, and this may render Angloromani discourse stretches unintelligible to speakers of English who have no familiarity with the Romani-derived vocabulary. Yet Angloromani does not show a consistent lexicon-grammar split, as speakers always have a choice as to when they might insert a Romani-derived lexical item. This is illustrated by the following example from recorded narration in a family context:

(7) Angloromani (Matras 2010: 6) (Romani-derived items italicised)

But anyway, and I was saying to our Jim, *kushti, dordi, dordi, dik* at the *luvva* we’ve *lelled* today, would’ya. How *kushti*, I’ll never *sutti torati* with excitement. You know, an’ all this. And me mam used to say: oh my dear, *dik* at *lesti*. *Vater*: oh how ever did that come to *lel* such a *mush*? Oh, what a *kushti chor, dik*, and it’s got a *moi* like a *jukkel*.

But anyway, and I was saying to our Jim, *good, dear, dear, look* at the *money* we’ve *taken* today, would’ya. How *good*, I’ll never *sleep tonight* with excitement. You know, an’ all this. And me mam used to say: oh my dear, *look* at *him*. *Watch*: oh how ever did that come to *get* such a *man*? Oh, what a *nice boy, look*, and it’s got a *mouth* like a *dog*.

Note that the Romani-derived elements in the example tend to include lexical items that are central to the most sensitive aspects of the content of the narrative, including taboo expressions, evaluative and judgemental attributes, and attention markers, but also a pronominal word – ‘him’. Contrary to some statements (cf. Thomason 2001: 234) there is no historical evidence to support the suggestion that Angloromani ever did show a consistent split between English grammar and Romani lexicon, nor is there evidence to suggest that the present

⁵ This population uses the term ‘Gypsy’ as self-appellation.

structure came about through a gradual borrowing of English grammar into a variety of Romani. Instead, historical documentation of the speech of English Gypsies, which is rather plentiful, suggests that Angloromani is a product of language shift from Romani to English, with speakers holding on to a Romani-derived vocabulary for use as an ‘emotive mode’ of discourse (see Matras 2010).

The process that gave rise to Angloromani is clearly distinct from the one observed in Acadian French or Domari, and the structural outcome is different as well, reflecting a communicative motivation to mark out lexical content for social meaning. The choice of distinct vocabulary items for core lexicon and the pronoun ‘him’ in the example establishes a kind of solidarity among the participants in the interaction and prompts the listener to engage with the propositional content from the perspective of shared attitudes and experiences. I will return to the performative aspects below. Whether or not we define Angloromani as an ML depends on the extent of ‘languageness’ that the definition would require: I suggest that there is a continuum between varieties like Angloromani, which are stylistic choices that are reserved for particular interactions and within them to individual utterances; varieties such as Ma’a, which can be used in entire stretches of discourse but only under certain circumstances (Mous 2003); and a language like Michif (Bakker 1997), which is the all-purpose home language of a community of speakers (for a discussion of the continuum see Matras 2020: 312ff).

Some MLs contain considerable inflectional material from both their source languages and show a more consistent complementary distribution of forms by etymological source, both features that are difficult to reconcile with the repertoire management model outlined above. Consider the following examples:

- (8) Michif (Adapted from Mazzoli 2019: 113) (French-derived items italicised, English derived items italicised and underlined):

Maaka	<i>li</i>	<i>dariee</i>	<i>zhornii</i> ,	<i>anima</i>	<i>la</i>
but	DEF.M	last	day.M.INAN	that.INAN	DEF.F
<i>maezoñ</i>		kaa-kii-li- <u>rent</u> -ii-yaan,		<i>ma</i>	<i>klee</i>
house.F.INAN	CNJ-PST	the-rent-THE.AI-CNJ.1S		POSS.F.S	key
gii-doo-meek-in		kiihtwam.			
1.PST-go-give.AI-IND.1S		again			

‘But *the last day, that house I rented*, I went there again to give back my key.’

- (9) Mednyj Aleut (Golovko 1996: 65–71) (Russian-derived items italicised):
oni taanga-χ su-la-jut
 they alcohol-SG take-MULT-3PL.PRES
 ‘they are buying alcohol’
- (10) Gurindji Kriol (McConvell & Meakins 2005: 11) (Gurindji-derived items italicised):
nyawa-ma wan karu bin plei-bat pak-ta nyanuny
 this-TOP one child PAST play-CONT park-LOC 3SG.DAT
warlaku-ywaung-ma
 dog-having-TOP
 ‘This one kid was playing at the park with his dog.’

In Michif, finite predication grammar is consistently Cree while noun phrase modifiers are consistently French. In Mednyj Aleut, finite predication grammar is Russian as are subject and object pronouns, while nominal inflection (including person affixes that mark possession) derives from Aleut. Gurindji Kriol shows Kriol finite predication grammar and Gurindji-derived nominal inflection (which, as the language developed, often underwent shifts in meaning, converging with Kriol; see Meakins 2011).

To summarise, then, borrowing, as I use the term with respect to ‘conventional’ repertoire management in multilingual settings and the processes of historical structural change that they can set in motion, typically targets non-basic vocabulary (with a preference for lexical items denoting cultural innovations, progressively expanding to other categories in a manner that is hierarchical, as described above), grammatical items that are high on the scale of processing presuppositional gaps or other loci of potential interactional tension (the grammar of ‘monitoring-and-directing’), form-meaning templates or semantic-syntactic patterns for both individual items and paradigms (for a more exhaustive discussion see Matras 2020). All these can be related to the motivations of the pull factors described above. What is crucial for our discussion is, however, what is not typically borrowed: full inflectional paradigms (both verbal and nominal), extensive core lexicon, and complete pronominal (deictic and anaphoric) paradigms. The ML prototype shows hybridity precisely in the etymological sources of those components: predication grammar from one source language, combined with one or more of nominal inflection, core vocabulary, or entire pronominal paradigms from another source language. That, I propose, is not an outcome of borrowing, but of a distinct process, which I describe in the next section.

4 Performativity and acts of identity

Drawing on a concept introduced by LePage and Tabouret-Keller (1985), Croft (2003) describes the emergence of MLs as ‘acts of identity’. Let us first go back to the original use of the concept. For LePage and Tabouret-Keller (1985), languages and groups cannot be taken as given. Instead they come into being through acts of identity that individuals do and share. These are manifested by the choice of linguistic features and their association with certain extra-linguistic attributes. Linguistic items are thus the means by which individuals identify themselves and others. Linguistic behaviour constitutes a series of acts of identity through which people reveal their identity and search for social roles. Examining corpora and questionnaire-based self-assessment in the Caribbean and among young people of Caribbean background in London, LePage and Tabouret-Keller observe that the particular co-occurrence of linguistic items and non-linguistic variables is often unpredictable. Instead there are degrees of association, which are permeable, and a continuum that is multidimensional: People can share the same repertoire but differ in the extent to which they use each component. Thus, youth of Jamaican background in London use occasional Jamaican features in their English speech to assert in-group identity. They refer to this as ‘Jamaican’, though it is not always possible to arrange features on a linear scale from standard to non-standard. LePage and Tabouret-Keller conclude that speech acts are speakers’ invitation to others to share their view of the world. Behavioural patterns allow individuals to identify groups, to get access to them, and be motivated to join them and modify their own behaviour accordingly. ‘Language’ therefore carries several meanings: It is in one sense the actual behaviour of people, and in another sense the perceived system that is considered to overlap with community or group membership and thus in effect the socially constructed labelling of a group’s linguistic behaviour. Once linguistic behaviour is reified it becomes symbolic of group membership, often intertwined with self-ascription. Language is thus not objectively defined but rather a concept formed by individuals who project concepts onto those around them and establish networks of shared suppositions and behaviours.

Croft (2003) combines this notion of ‘acts of identity’ with his evolutionary model of language change (Croft 2000) which attributes change to the initiation, replication and ultimately conventionalisation of innovative linguistic templates, which he calls ‘linguemes’. Croft views the formation of MLs as the spread of hybridised linguemes that draw on two source languages, the first associated with what Croft calls the heritage society, the second with the adoptive society. Referring to the concept of ‘functional turnover’ and the pathways of ‘lexical re-orientation’ and ‘selective replication’ described in Matras (2000b),

Croft proposes that in language contact situations positive acts of identity determine the source of basic vocabulary. Thus, in language maintenance, but also in cases of functional turnover where the ancestral language serves symbolic purposes, basic vocabulary derives from the heritage language. By contrast, in language shift and semi-shift, basic vocabulary derives from the language of the adoptive society, while mixed marriage languages adopt basic vocabulary from both. This approach regards basic vocabulary as the element that users of language most easily identify as a ‘primary parent language’ (Croft 2003: 68).

One might however contend that while vocabulary offers a symbolic identification with a society (in the sense of a community of cultural practices), predication grammar is an indicator of the ‘primary language’ (to draw on Croft’s term) that users of language rely on to process utterances and therefore as the basis of communicative interaction. The point about MLs is that they tend to show a split between the language (etymologically speaking) in which utterances are anchored, and the language that is used to symbolise content. That, if we take lexicon-grammar split as the principal feature of ML formation, as Croft does. The reality is of course more complex: As we saw above, some MLs (so designated), such as Angloromani, only make occasional use of ‘heritage society’ vocabulary, and of minor features of heritage society grammar; others, like Michif, show, as Croft notes, mixed sources for both vocabulary and grammar, and so the notion of an identity act favouring either heritage or adoptive society is not particularly helpful as a guiding definition.

I propose that in order to account for ML formation we need to go back to the very emergence of what Croft calls the innovative ‘linguemes’ and hypothesise about the speech acts through which they emerge and the particular effect that their structural composition has on the interaction context. My hypothesis is that the speech acts that give rise to hybrid ‘linguemes’ are performative speech acts. I propose that they function as acts of identity by defying conventions on ordinary everyday language mixing or hybridity to which users in the multilingual setting are accustomed. What do I mean by ‘performative’ speech acts? Austin (1962) introduces the distinction between ‘constatives’ and ‘performatives’. He describes performatives as utterances that cannot be classified as true or false, while at the same time they entail the doing of an action and so in effect they constitute actions in their own right. While constatives are assessed by their content as true or false, performatives are assessed as felicitous or infelicitous, depending on whether the conditions to execute them properly are met. That distinction is widely regarded as superseded by Austin’s own taxonomy of illocutionary forces (cf. Levinson 1983: 235–236). However, for our discussion it is useful to adopt precisely that initial, rather crude distinction, as complementing its successor model. In other words, we can assume for our

purposes that an utterance will have its own illocutionary force, be that an assertion, a request, a question, a directive, and so on. But in addition it can also take on a performative meaning. That performative meaning is achieved by drawing attention to the utterance through the use of a combination of structural resources that is unconventional yet still intelligible to the interlocutor. In the bilingual setting, speakers are accustomed to combining resources from within their repertoire of linguistic forms (language mixing), and so ordinary and expected code-mixing will not invariably achieve a performative effect, only through particular contextual indexing. But a composition that is unexpected even in the bilingual setting can be certain to have a performative effect. Its exceptionality will manifest itself in the defiance of common conventions on language mixing, or management of linguistic resources in the repertoire. That exceptionality sends a message to the listener and so it constitutes an action in its own right, in our case the expression of a social attitude of bonding with the listener and of resistance toward surrounding or external social values or an encroaching social order. Once it becomes a template that can be replicated by others, the ‘lingueme’ is formed.

At this point it is useful to refer to the further development of the concept of performativity in the social sciences. Derrida (1988 [1972]) points out that Austin’s notion of ‘performative’ does not describe something that is outside of language, but something that produces or transforms a situation. However, given the iteration of utterances, their existence is independent of context and felicity conditions. An utterance is thus intelligible even if its referent is absent or if it is not anchored in objective reality. Derrida concludes that language structure is therefore by definition performative, because it is not possible to completely separate meaning from context, or intention from felicity conditions. This stance inspires Butler (1990, 2010) to argue that performativity refers to speech acts as a way of constituting (or de-constituting) a phenomenon. This notion of performativity counters the positivism with which we assume certain understandings of phenomena, including the presumption of certain culturally constructed categories; instead, it sets in motion processes that lead to certain realities or consequences. Butler regards identity as performative since it is manufactured through a sustained set of acts. The key to performativity is repetition (Derrida’s ‘iterativity’) and the power through which speech acts can form and shape identity. In that sense identity is subject to ‘self-making’ through the means of the performative illocution that is perpetually transmitted via speech acts.

Butler (1990: 194–199) emphasises that what she calls ‘signification’ (the constitution of a new subject) is not a single founding act but a process of repetition; ‘agency’ is defined in this connection as being located within the possibility of introducing variation on repetitive processes, thereby subverting them and the identities that they produce. Of particular relevance to our discussion

is what Butler describes as practices of parody: These serve a derived, phantasmatic or mimetic function that excludes something from the natural or real, subverting established norms and re-conceptualising identities as effects that are produced or generated rather than being foundational or fixed. We can apply this to our understanding of a community that is undergoing rapid transformations through shifts in cultural allegiances and practices, including such events as the coming together of parents of different backgrounds, seasonal labour migration, or rapid social changes such as the emergence of new institutions and authorities that question traditional sets of values and power relations. In many such settings, it is the young generation that assumes a new sense of agency to construe its own identity.

How can we then imagine the initial occurrence of hybrid utterances that defy conventional patterns of language mixing in a bilingual setting, in such a way as to capture the attention of an interlocutor and to construe a statement of identity and bonding? Consider example (11) from a trilingual (Hebrew-German-English) child raised in an environment where language separation (by interlocutor and groups of interlocutors) is generally maintained, even with the parents, who live in separate households. Lexical insertions and occasional code-mixing around quotations and emphasis are common as long as the interlocutors are able to understand all elements employed; there is also frequent convergence of lexical-semantic and sometimes syntactic patterns, and use of expletives and verbal gestures that crosses the boundaries of labelled languages (for a detailed description see Matras 2020: 11ff.). There is thus, despite the spatial and interlocutor-based separation of languages, a general 'license' to resort to creative combinations of elements from the wider, multilingual repertoire of linguistic resources, as long as this does not risk a breakdown in the effectiveness of communication (intelligibility). But in (11) we see a different kind of pattern, one that contrasts sharply with those general trends. The setting is the home of the Hebrew-speaking parent. There are no other participants or bystanders in the interaction. It is the evening hour and the child, aged 8 and 6 months, has been prompted by the parent to prepare for bed. As he enters the bathroom to wash he addresses the parent:

- (11) Trilingual child, age 8:6 (German items italicised, Hebrew items italicised and underlined):

Aba! Where do I get a *Lappen* so I can *wisch* my *Gesicht*?

Daddy! Where do I get a *washcloth* so I can *wipe* my *face*?

While language mixing, as I explained, is common in the household and often expected in certain turns and with references to certain subjects, in (11) the child makes two choices that stand out as irregular in terms of the established

interaction routines (including language mixing routines) in the home: First, while selecting the usual term of address for the parent (the Hebrew word for ‘Daddy’), he chooses to address the parent in English, a language that is usually reserved in the interaction between them for quotations, idiomatic phrase replication, and otherwise lexical insertions. But here, the sentence frame, predication grammar, and illocutionary force (marking the utterance as a question) are all in English. Second, the selection of English is not consistent, but intertwined with German, which is used for all key content lexemes in the utterance. Once again, there is no such established routine in the household interaction. German, too, is drawn upon in interaction between the child and this parent for quotes, single word emphasis, or other lexical insertions, and sometimes inadvertently around discourse markers and similar expressions; but here the choice is not driven by such indexical considerations that are local to the context but instead by a wholesale aesthetic motivation. By pointing out that a key pre-requisite for the task (availability of a washcloth) is missing, the child seemingly challenges the parent’s instruction and thereby the parent’s authority. But that challenge is toned down through the irregular structural composition of the utterance. The utterance is performative, since it defies conventional routines of repertoire management in order to achieve a humorous effect, which might in this instance best be described as a mimicry or caricature of defiance of authority (“if you are using your authority to command me to wash and prepare for bed, then I am staging a mock rebellion by challenging you to provide the necessary pre-requisites”). At the same time, the fact that the components for the utterance are all drawn from the multilingual repertoire of structural resources that the two interlocutors share, implies a bonding, a solidarity effect, a display of loyalty and a shared pool of experiences and values that can be celebrated. What is seemingly a playful act of defiance is thus an act of shared identity construction. In reaching out to the interlocutor, the speaker is inviting an acknowledgement of such shared identity. In that respect, the utterance, in its particular composition, is an act of claiming agency.

This particular example does not represent a setting in which such utterances are likely to be replicated habitually thereby turning into what Croft (2003) calls ‘linguemes’. However, we can imagine that it is precisely this kind of linguistic creativity which, in a small and tight-knit community, used among young people in search of a way to re-frame social attitudes and values, can indeed become an iterative act of identity which in time will come to represent a collective. Peng (2016) discusses the case of the adoption of the English progressive marker *-ing* in Chinese social media discourse. It involves script

switching and the attachment of the marker to indicate the broad aspectual meaning of progressive action that is associated with its use in English:

(12) English *-ing* in Chinese social media texts (Peng 2016: 8–13)

- a. 福州 ING
Fúzhōu
'Being in Fuzhou'
- b. 有准备 ing.
ing yǒu zhǔnbèi-ing
'We are preparing'
- c. 复习前几天的笔记 ing
fùxí qián jǐ tiān de bǐjì-ing
'Reviewing the notes that were made several days ago'

As seen in the examples, *-ing* is normally placed at the end of the phrase, which can even be a place name, and it is not necessarily attached to the lexical verb as in the English source. At the same time it is often found to substitute the Chinese aspectual markers *zai* and *zhong*, which express simultaneity and proximity. Peng (2016) collected data from the popular Chinese social media outlets Weibo, Douban and Zhihu. She attributes the common use of *-ing* to a language play in defiance of normal Chinese writing conventions. The creators of this usage are described as young 'netizens' who engage in an effort to present themselves as trendy and fashionable and attract attention. They do so by identifying as members of an economic and cultural community that possesses a high level of English skills; this is taken to imply open attitudes and world experience. They thereby distinguish themselves from an older generation of non-learners or infrequent users of English.

Both examples demonstrate real-time performative use of language mixing that is not the product of a conventional balancing act of repertoire management in multilingual interaction settings. Both involve deliberate acts that expressively defy conventions of repertoire choices even in an environment that acknowledges multilingual repertoire complexity. They provide evidence for the plausibility of Thomason's (2015: 41) speculation about Copper Island (Mednyj) Aleut as involving "conscious diffusion of inflectional morphology" and an "element of deliberation". That means, however, that the intertwining of certain functional categories found in MLs such as Mednyj Aleut is not the outcome of common repertoire management routines of the kind described above, but of distinct processes.

Unfortunately, we have no substantive documentation of the conventionalisation of spontaneous performative utterances such as the one in example (11) into regular community-based styles of speech. But Peng's (2016) observations demonstrate the potential of performative language mixing to become the marker of a community. What we do have, however, is evidence from so-called 'symbiotic' MLs (Smith 1995), which essentially involve drawing on a special reservoir of lexical items for in-group communication. This kind of strategy is most commonly associated with cryptolects, a notion applied to in-group varieties ranging from youth and urban slangs such as Verlan, those of professional groups and especially itinerant traders and performers, and the in-group varieties of ethnic minorities with a tradition of peripatetic service economies.

Binchy (1993) describes how the community of Irish Travellers use Shelta (a lexicon based on sound manipulation of Irish and English words, embedded into Hiberno-English conversation) when discussing matters that are highly contextual and so require a high degree of shared background knowledge. Typical such conversation domains include making a living among non-Travellers, maintaining boundaries between Travellers and settled people and communication about intimate domains. In Matras (2010) I describe similar uses of so-called Angloromani or what the users themselves call English Romany or English Romanes. Here too the choice of the special lexical inventory that is derived from Romani (the ancestral community language, which appears to have been abandoned toward the second half of the nineteenth century) is a statement: It is a call on the listener to interpret the propositional content of the utterance in light of a specialised or exclusive presuppositional domain. In (13) a Romani man is signalling the end of a brief exchange with a friend whose conversation with a police officer he had interrupted at an open-air public event. With the police officer still being within sight though probably not within eavesdropping distance, the speaker says:

- (13) Angloromani: conclusion of short interruptive exchange (Matras 2010: 135)

Right, I'll leave you to *rokker* with the *muskra*
 'Right, I'll leave you to *talk* with the *policeman*'

Secrecy or deliberate camouflaging of content are not necessarily involved. Rather, the key is that of a personal message between the speaker and the addressee, concluding the brief exchange between them and expressing the speaker's withdrawal from the interaction in acknowledgment that he had interrupted an ongoing conversation with a stranger. The use of Romani here

marks out the turning point in the conversation. But it also establishes an indexical hierarchy of personal loyalties, signalling recognition that although the speaker is yielding to the addressee's earlier conversation with the stranger, the bond between the speaker and the addressee is stronger than the one between the addressee and his other interlocutor, the policeman, and that the speaker is withdrawing for practical and tactical reasons, recognising the benefits of showing respect toward others' conversation.

Conversations recorded within the Romani family show a continuum of usages ranging from emphatic dramatising of states of affairs and humorous self-ridicule (14), to directives that are seemingly menacing but in reality endearing (15), to the encoding of terms around sensitive content or potential danger (16), and on to the flagging of boundaries in interaction with group outsiders (17) (data from Matras 2010: 137ff):

- (14) Oh, *dik* at the state of my *bal*, oh I'll have to *jaw* somewhere to somebody could do a hairdresser to get me *bal* done, ooh *dik* at the state of it!
 'Oh, *look* at the state of my *hair*, oh I'll have to *go* somewhere to somebody could do a hairdresser to get me *hair* done, ooh *look* at the state of it!'
- (15) *Ol* the *obben* coz when the *raklis jels* I'm gonna *mor* yas.
 '*Eat* the *food* coz when the *girls go* I'm gonna *beat* yous!'
- (16) I'd tell 'em not to *chor* in the *burrika*
 'I'd tell 'em not to *steal* in the *shop*.'
- (17) *Mush jins* everything ya *rokkerin*' anyway.
 '[The] *man knows* everything you're *sayin*' anyway.'

'Lekoudesch' was the designation used by a circle of men in the village of Re-xingen in the Black Forest region of Germany for a form of speech that imitated the use of Hebrew derived vocabulary in dialectal German by Jewish cattle traders in the pre-war period. As boys, the Christian men had often been hired by Jews to help drive cattle to the markets and were thus exposed to the code. That code was accessible in principle to all members of the Jewish community; they were familiar with Hebrew vocabulary in Ashkenazic pronunciation from scriptures and prayer. However, in the vernacular it was used primarily as a way of excluding bystanders and affirming group-internal solidarity as part of the cattle trade. After World War II and the loss of the local Jewish community following emigration and the Holocaust, the boys, now adults, continued to use the

principal features of the cryptolect: Hebrew-derived vocabulary and some relaxation of grammatical rules such as definite articles and the use of the present-tense existential verb. This was used as a group-internal code to comment on bystanders, and as a source of entertainment and group solidarity. As the circle of men with active knowledge of Lekoudesch declined, the style became a symbol of a tight-knit community of friends and neighbours in the village, who usually frequented one of just several local pubs and sat at a designated table for regulars ('Stammtisch'). Examples (18) and (19) are informants' replication of the original use as a language of business, while (20)–(22) record spontaneous commentaries made in the pub in respect of non-group member bystanders (data from my own recordings in 1984; Hebrew derived items are italicised):

- (18) Alle *gimmel doff*.
'All *three* are good'
- (19) Die *båra* isch *mechätz*.
'The cow is *ill*'
- (20) D'r *guj veroumelt lou*.
'The *man* doesn't understand'
- (21) *Lou dibra*, d'r *guj schäfft!*
'Don't speak, the *man is-there* [=a stranger is listening]'
- (22) Die *goja* isch *haggel doff*, dia kennt-m'r *lekächa*.
'The *woman* is very *pretty*, one could *take* her [=sleep with her]'

The group of men shared an inventory of narratives that were familiar to its members and appear to have been told many times for entertainment. These stories revolve around the use of Lekoudesch during the times when Jews still inhabited the village. They tend to have one of two themes: Some capture the humorous effect of a situation where an individual was excluded from a conversation through the use of Lekoudesch. Others capture the irony of a situation when somebody attempted to use the code to exclude or embarrass others, on the assumption that the code was not accessible to them, only then to learn that they were in fact immersed in it, and were able to use it to embarrass those who had tried to ridicule them in the first place. Such anecdotes gave the mixed code a new form of vitality as its function shifted to capture memories of old times while activating the shared pool of humorous stories that consolidated the group

socially. Both the spontaneous use of *Lekoudesch* in the pub and its use in rehearsed stories amounted to a performance of a distinctive group identity among a small circle of male friends.

5 Performative functions and the formation of MLs

The discussion in the previous section demonstrated that both lexical and morphological material can be used consciously to perform acts of solidarity among individuals, family members or members of a regular circle of friends, members of a minority ethnic community with a particular socio-economic relationship to majority society, or members of an online community flagging their socio-economic position and societal attitudes. I discussed examples of spontaneous, semi-conventionalised, and highly conventionalised mixing. Common to all cases is the fact that the structural outcomes differ considerably from those that are the typical products of re-setting boundaries as part of repertoire management strategies through which speakers in a multilingual environment seek to balance three pull factors: accommodation (to the choice of features expected in the setting and context, or language choice), exhausting expressive potential (around semantic meaning), and economising processing load (primarily around interaction management and the processing of presupposition).

Discussions of MLs tend to focus on their structural profiles and do not, generally speaking, offer insights from a discourse-interaction perspective into their early stages of emergence – usually due to lack of accessible data, and in part perhaps also due to the nature of elicited data. There are, however, interpretations and analyses that suggest a performative origin of MLs, including those that involve intertwining of grammatical paradigms. Bakker (1997) views the genesis of *Michif* as an almost pre-determined process where the first generation of a new community born to Cree mothers and French fathers combines elements of both languages as an aesthetic representation of their independent identity. In the absence of attestation of the early stages, no exemplification can be offered of the utterances that first gave rise to the mixing pattern and their possible distinct illocutionary purpose during a period where speakers still had command of both source languages. Golovko (2003) goes further and hypothesises that the creators of MLs were generally “folk linguistic engineers” who engaged in playful mixing, manipulating components of their repertoire in forms that defy the normally attested and predicted patterns of language mixing. Mous (2003), in his description of *Ma’a* or *Inner Mbugu*, the group-internal

speech variety of the Ma'a people of Tanzania, follows Sasse's (1992) suggestion that favours deliberate strategies of relexification as a way of flagging identity following the shift from the Cushitic language Gorwaa to the Bantu language Pare. As evidence Mous cites among other factors the varied composition of the special Ma'a lexicon, which includes not just Gorwaa items but also material from other sources including Maasai and manipulated Normal Mbugu (Pare). The process thus resembles the formation of cryptolects and the scenarios of lexical retention from an ancestral language, and lexical extraction from a tradition of scriptures, that characterise the emergence of Angloromani and Lekoudesch, respectively. Meakins (2011) describes the emergence of Gurindji Kriol as a form of resistance against linguistic and cultural assimilation to the pan-Aboriginal community in the north of Australia, following colonisation and the shift in most Aboriginal communities to English-based Kriol. Meakins argues that a prolonged phase of code-switching gave rise to a stable ("grammaticalised") mixed variety. Nonetheless, Meakins employs the term 'borrowing' with reference to the replication of Gurindji-derived nominal inflection in a predication that is framed and anchored by Kriol grammar. In light of the explanatory account of the ML as essentially an aesthetic act of cultural resistance, 'borrowing' must be understood in this context as something that is very different from the balancing of pull factors in everyday multilingual repertoire management. As noted above, I prefer to reserve the term borrowing to those instances and not to use it to describe the distinctive formation processes of MLs.

The essence of the performativity that is involved in ML formation can thus be understood precisely as going against speakers' intuitive and usually well-rehearsed patterns not just of where demarcation boundaries are normally construed between sets of features within the repertoire, and how repertoire components and sets of features are aligned with interaction routines, but also how such construed boundaries can be crossed and modified. The performative crossing of boundaries sets relevant utterances apart from patterns of mixing that are otherwise common and acceptable in the community of users, in order to convey an aesthetic and emotive statement. This requires us to add to the model of repertoire management an overarching dimension that allows and at times prompts users to override or interfere with the more conventional balancing acts among pull factors that serve straightforward communication, one that adds an aesthetic aspect of performativity to the range of illocutions of everyday discourse interaction.

Contributions to the present volume survey a range of structural phenomena that can be accommodated in various ways in relation to the hypothesis about the role of performativity in ML formation and help fine-tune the analytical category of MLs and its relation to (conventional) borrowing. Hannß's discussion of

Kallaway describes what might be regarded as a classic performative function, where users choose from a contained and clearly demarcated lexical reservoir in order to perform very particular ritual acts of speech. Sippola's analysis of an Ilokan Spanish letter gives insight into what might have been an act of bonding between writer and addressee, where Spanish lexicon, formulaic expressions such as greetings, and the occasional Tagalog loanword are inserted into what are otherwise consistently Ilokano sentences. In the absence of other similar evidence from a community of users, the letter might be regarded as a single communicative event in which the mode of combining repertoire elements takes on a performative function. Pecht's chapter on *Cité Duits* allows us to speculate about a possible playful language activity as the origin of an in-group variety used to flag group bonding among a circle of male speakers in a coal-mining community, marked by the use of a distinctive paradigm of personal pronouns that draws on the three source languages in the pool of shared linguistic resources. These cases show us that performativity can have a range of structural manifestations, from the use of just a single functional paradigm, through the occasional use of a special lexical reservoir.

Clements, Amaral and Garrett describe Barranquenho as a local variety that represents the distinctive identity of the inhabitants of Barrancos and their particular history of persisting cross-border contacts. Barranquenho appears to be characterised by an importation of a small number of Spanish features into Portuguese. Apart from lexical items, these include phonological features as well as convergence in the formation of the progressive aspect and the placement of clitics. All these can be accounted for as predictable products of repertoire management and the use of certain features across communication routines for which different labelled 'languages' are used (borrowing). In fact, they strongly resemble the kind of interference processes exhibited by learner varieties: persistence of an 'accent', use of selected lexicon and discourse markers, and persistence of ordering of referents in complex clauses. What appears to be emblematic and in that sense performative in Barranquenho is the permanent use of such L2 interference features and their adoption as markers of local identity, even by the younger generation that speaks Portuguese as its principal language. Thus, it appears to be the conventionalisation of linguistic interference features used by earlier generations that serves an aesthetic, identity forging function.⁶

⁶ The case is in some aspects reminiscent of the Pacific language Rea Rapa (Walworth 2017), where speaker deliberately substitute some features of Tahitian retaining local archaisms in order to set themselves apart from the majority language of Tahiti.

I am reminded here of the formation of what has been referred to in recent literature as ‘multi-ethnolects’ – the slang of urban youth that is characterised by a strong impact of immigrant varieties. Evidence from some of these varieties suggests that their distinctive features involve imitation and performative adoption of the parent generation’s second-language learner (interference) features by the children of immigrants. For Kiezdeutsch in Germany (Wiese 2009; Freywald et al. 2011), for instance, these include, along with the use of some lexical items and exclamations from the heritage languages, the reduction of German grammatical inflection and grammatical markers, simplification of word order rules, and a tendency to generalise listener-related connective word order patterns, as well as an over-generalisation of certain discourse marking and chaining devices. The latter two mark heavy reliance on procedures that guide listener-sided processing and reassure the speaker of interaction harmony, both typical of advanced second language learner styles (cf. Matras 2020: 63).

Bakker (this volume) refers to ML formation as an act of identity in cases of new community formation but questions its relevance to languages like Gurindji Kriol and Light Walpiri, where Aboriginal identity is retained. However, precisely that process, the mapping of group identity onto language, is described by Meakins (2011) as the act of cultural resistance that gives rise to Gurindji Kriol. It follows that ‘identity’ need not be understood only as the emergence of a new labelled community. Rather, it is the act of setting oneself apart that finds its manifestation in creative linguistic performativity. While it may be argued that Gurindji Aboriginals might have simply retained their ancestral language Gurindji as a way of demonstrating their ethnic identity, and that Romani Gypsies in England might have done the same with inflected Romani, the reality in both settings was the change to the repertoire management dynamics as a result of the massive impact of the surrounding languages, Kriol and English respectively. Holding on to selected structures of the ancestral language, or selective replication (Matras 2000b), is therefore precisely an act of identity. The concept of performativity allows us to link both the emergence of new communities and the maintenance of community boundaries with the patterns of utterance formation that give rise to the MLs.

Stewart and Meakins define MLs as speech varieties that are created for expressive rather than communicative purposes. Their three case studies (Media Lengua, Gurindji Kriol and Michif) appear to suggest, however, that the performative aspect of MLs is manifested by the particular combinations of morphosyntax and lexicon rather than in creative processes in phonology or phonetics, where the systems of the source languages continue more or less intact, subject to common processes of levelling. Deibel’s discussion of Media Lengua word order similarly reveals that ordinary processes are in motion within the grammar

of an ML irrespective of the background for its formation. The integration of French nominal stems into Cree-inflected verbal predications in Michif (Mazzoli, Bakker and DeMontigny) seemingly contradicts the template of verb-noun etymological split; but in fact it serves to show how an ML, when it becomes a full-fledged language, is subject to its own repertoire management dynamics, and the selection of features for semantic expansion is no longer guided merely by the etymology of the individual components.

Several case studies in the volume describe far-reaching structural contact phenomena that lie on the fringe of heavy borrowing and ML formation. Thus, Jopara (Dudek Herring and Clements) appears to be the conventionalisation of the principle of frequent mixing of phrases and features of Spanish and Guaraní as a manifestation of a linguistically mixed identity. It may therefore best be described as a performative style rather than an ML, or the accumulation of simultaneous insertions as local expressions of repertoire management. Wutun (Sandman) is essentially a case of Sinitic morphological material that is adapted to the converging patterns of the surrounding Tibetic and Mongolic languages of the Amdo linguistic area, giving rise to Altaicised features including the loss of tones and classifiers, changes in word order, and the emergence of agglutinative suffixes drawing on Sinitic material. Apart from lexical borrowing, it also shows morphological borrowing of the incompletive aspect marker from Tibetan and of the Mongolic interrogative morpheme and terminative affix. What stands out in Wutun are the multiple sources and the combination of radical typological restructuring, along with the presence of some borrowed morphemes (in domains related to interaction management and aktionsart, which are generally prone to borrowing). These processes can be accommodated within the model of repertoire management and conventional and widely attested matter and pattern replication (see Matras 2020), and do not require a performative dimension as an explanation. In sum, Jopara does not appear to be a conventionalised ML in which new ‘linguemes’ have been established through replication, while Wutun does not appear to adhere to the ML prototype nor does it display a combination of structural components of different sources that cannot be accounted for within the framework of usual repertoire management or borrowing.

Discussing the usage of Turkish-derived lexical verbs that carry Turkish inflection in a dialect of Romani from Thrace, Adamou provides experimental evidence in support of the argument that Turkish-derived verbs for which speakers have no Romani-derived equivalent are processed as fast as Romani-derived verbs and that their Turkish-derived inflection does not incur additional processing cost. That differs from the processing of Turkish-derived verbs that do have Romani-derived counterparts. This would suggest that the established Turkish verbs are not part of an ongoing balancing act between

pull factors, whereas those that are not established are. There is no suggestion that Turkish predicate grammar diffuses onto Romani verb stems; the synchronic picture in Thrace Romani is thus quite distinct from MLs, where there is in fact no etymological split within the predication grammar. In terms of the repertoire management model, Thrace Romani, like the incipient trend in Parakalamos Romani exemplified above, and that in several other Romani dialects, appears to show a far-reaching compromise between exhausting expressive potential, accommodation, and load reduction: Turkish lexical verbs extend expressive potential (and do not have an indigenous counterpart). They are accommodated into utterances that the setting and context define as Romani. Load reduction accompanies the process as it eliminates the need to select and inhibit features of finite verb inflection around these particular verbs. This gives rise to fusion among the two languages (Romani and Turkish) around predicate anchoring procedures for a particular class of lexical verbs. The hypothesis that Thrace Romani displays an interim stage that could lead onto the wholesale replacement of Romani-derived verbs (and their Romani inflection) by Turkish-derived verbs (and their Turkish-derived inflection) is intriguing, though no known Romani dialect in the region appears to have replaced all or even most of its Romani lexical verbs with Turkish-derived material.⁷

Where does this place Thrace Romani on the periphery between borrowing and MLs? What is exceptional here is the borrowing of a verb inflection paradigm, which, as I argued above, is not a typical outcome of borrowing (being the product of repertoire management strategies). On the other hand, in showing two distinct sources of predication grammar, and otherwise consistent transmission across generations of Romani core lexicon and grammatical features (including verb and nominal inflection, paradigms of personal and demonstrative pronouns, and so on), Thrace Romani certainly does not adhere to the ML prototype. I would therefore classify it as an exceptional case of borrowing, where, as described, pull factors interact in a unique way. My take on this uniqueness is that, rather than draw on the predication grammar of another language (here Turkish; and in the example above from Parakalamos Romani, Greek; and so on) for performative purposes, what appears to be in operation in these Romani communities is a relaxation of the pull factor which I termed

⁷ However, it appears that Romani varieties that have lost contact with Turkish such as that of Ajia Varvara in Athens (Iglá 1996) retain a smaller number of Turkish-inflected verbs than those where speakers have active knowledge of Turkish (cf. Adamou 2019, this volume). There might therefore be some evidence for a trajectory of both proportional increase and decrease of the number of Turkish verbs in Balkan Romani dialects.

above as accommodation: Adhering to the anchoring of predications in the heritage language is perceived as less of a must in displaying group membership. In that sense, we might regard Thrace Romani and similar cases as a less strict and more relaxed identity manifestation process (though thereby still a certain kind of meaningful identity act) than a positive and performative display of boundary construction.

6 Conclusion

The idea that code-mixing can have performative functions is well-established, from the conversation analytical approaches by Gumperz (1980) and Auer (1984), through to Poplack's (1980) notion of switching as a flagging of bilingual competence, Myers-Scotton's notion of marked choices in bilingual conversation, Maschler's (1994) discussion of the bonding effect of switching around meta-linguistic operators, Li Wei and Milroy's (1995) approach to language negotiation in conversation sequences, and more. While discussions of ML emergence have frequently referred to deliberate mixing and identity acts, as mentioned above, few if any have attempted to draw an explicit connection between language mixing as a performative act and the conventionalisation of mixed structures that defy predictions on conventional contact-induced change. In this chapter I have argued in favour of a performative origin of MLs. I proposed that performativity might be regarded as a super-imposed illocutionary dimension that can accompany the realisation of acts of speech and their inherent illocutions, be they assertions, directives, questions and so on. I also suggested that performativity can have an overarching effect on the management of resources within users' repertoire of linguistic features.

Users in multilingual settings are accustomed to carrying out selection and inhibition among the features that are at their disposal in a manner that is dynamic, creative and responsive to communicative contexts and situations. Such repertoire management operations are normally guided by a balancing act between three pull factors: accommodation to the expectations of the interaction context and interlocutor constellation, exhausting the expressive potential of the repertoire, and effective management of processing load. Repertoire management choices can be one-off or lead to a re-drawing of construed boundaries around sets of features within the repertoire. This results in what we perceive analytically as structural change in the profile of a labelled language. In reality that means a change in the way features from the repertoire are mapped onto communication routines. That is what we normally coin as 'borrowing', and I

propose that we reserve that term for such processes. The nature of the pull factors involved, and the way they affect the inherent functional-communicative value of distinct linguistic features as triggers of mental processing operations, make the potential for re-alignment of repertoire components predictable to a considerable extent.

To be sure, other factors of a local nature play a role, and often a significant one, in prompting, or in hindering particular directions of change; such instances were named above, and other examples were recently discussed by Melissarpoulou and Ralli (2019). They tend to involve particular motivations such as formal analogies, taboos, and similar. But we can expect that unless constraining factors (such as institutional scripting) are at play, language users in multilingual settings will be inclined to re-draw construed language boundaries in particular ways, with recourse to a varied yet not unlimited set of possible pathways, such as a balance between matter and pattern replication around particular functional categories (Matras 2007, 2020). These may be among the pathways that Thomason (1995) had once described as “ordinary processes” while claiming that in the case of MLs they can lead to “extraordinary results”. My argument in this chapter is that there are indeed ordinary processes, well attested empirically, but that those ordinary processes do not in fact lead to the extraordinary results that catch our attention in MLs (and therefore merit the explicit label as ‘Mixed Languages’). Instead, the extraordinary results are the product of a distinct operation through which users combine features from their repertoire in a way that explicitly clashes with normal expectations of repertoire management strategies. They do so in order to achieve aesthetic, performative effects.

Performative acts stand out and thereby draw attention. They serve a rallying effect that is a demonstration of loyalty and shared norms that defy and contrast with expectations and established routines, especially those that are externally imposed. Such effects can be identified in single interactions among a pair of interlocutors, in social circles bonded by location, age, or profession, in virtual communities, in marginalised ethnic communities and in communities striving to maintain or establish a distinct cultural identity. Following LePage and Tabouret-Keller (1985) I take in this context an explicitly non-essentialist approach to ‘community’, regarding it as a bonding around shared practices (see also Blokland 2017; Bessant 2018; Brubaker and Cooper 2000). Multilingual performativity can become one of those practice routines around which new identities can be forged; it is a pathway toward new community formation, or in defence of an existing community that feels under threat. That is what allows performativity to be conventionalised, leading to the so-called extraordinary structures that we find in MLs. What has sometimes been referred to as the ‘grammaticalisation’ of casual mixing (or code-switching) giving rise to stable MLs is, in effect, the gradual

neutralisation of the particular illocutionary effect of performative mixed utterances. In light of this, MLs are not counterexamples to borrowing, if we consider borrowing to be the outcomes of the ordinary processes that emerge through renegotiation of practice routines guided by everyday pull factors. Indeed, their mere existence provides us with an insight into multilingual users' implicit awareness of the limits on language mixing in everyday communicative routines and their playful defiance of those limits for special effect or performativity.

The present volume is dedicated to what the editors identify in their introductory chapter (Mazzoli and Sippola) as core-periphery relations in the study of MLs. I take the liberty to interpret the core-periphery relationship as capturing two separate dimensions. Formally, we are dealing with a range of structural phenomena that strike us at first glance as exceptional among the pool of many cases of documented contact-induced changes. These include the high density of structural outcomes resulting from an array of different contacts in Wutun (Sandman) as well as the rare appearance of compartmentalisation in the structure of finite predication grammar in Thrace Romani (Adamou), while on the other hand phonetic and phonological processes in a number of MLs (Stewart and Meakins), word order variation in *Media Lengua* (Deibel), and verb derivation from nominal stems in Michif (Mazzoli, Bakker and DeMontigny) demonstrate that extraordinary outcomes, once stable, are equally subjected to ordinary processes of variation and change.

Functionally, we see a continuum of performative routines: From what may be an individual choice among a pair of interlocutors in correspondence (Sippola), though the use of a mixed casual style (Dudek Herring and Clements), onto conventionalised local preferences (Clements, Amaral and Garrett; Pecht) and ritual modes of speech (Hannß). My own examples presented above nicely match this continuum, showing one-off usage among a pair of interlocutors (child-parent interaction), a pool of lexical features used by a circle of local peers (villagers in the Black Forest), a stable lexical reservoir used by a minority community (Angloromani) and a single morphological feature marking out an online social network community (Chinese netizens). Their structural outcomes stand out as not conforming to the typical results of re-alignment of construed boundaries within the repertoire in non-performative communication routines.

The core definition of MLs might therefore be reserved for those idioms that are highly conventionalised, whose formation is best explained by taking into account the interactional perspective: MLs arise from performative acts that exploit the contrast between construed boundaries within the shared linguistic repertoire. They do so in a way that stands out, by targeting structural components and categories that are otherwise less likely to be subjected to the re-drawing of such boundaries. For that reason, they are 'extraordinary' outcomes of processes

that are themselves ‘extraordinary’, albeit, obviously, humanly possible. But they owe their existence, in a sense, to the defiance of the processes that give rise to borrowing, and that is why they differ from ordinary borrowing.

Abbreviations

AI	animate intransitive
CNJ	conjunct order
COMP	complementiser
CONT	continuative
DAT	dative
F	feminine
IND	indicative
INDEF	indefinitive
LOAN	loan adaptation marker
LOC	locative
M	masculine
MULT	multiplicative
NEG	negation
OBL	oblique
PERF	perfective
PL	plural
POSS	possessive
PRED	predication marker
PRES	present
PRG	progressive
PST	past
REFL	reflexive
S, SG	singular
THE	theme
TOP	topic

References

- Adamou Evangelia. 2010. Bilingual Speech and Language Ecology in Greek Thrace: Romani and Pomak in Contact with Turkish. *Language in Society* 39(2). 147–171.
- Adamou Evangelia & Shen, Rachel X. 2019. There are no language switching costs when codeswitching is frequent. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 23(1). 53–70.
- Auer, Peter. 1984. *Bilingual conversation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Auer, Peter. 1999. From Code-switching via Language Mixing to Fused Lects: Toward a dynamic typology of bilingual speech. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 3(4). 309–332.

- Austin, John L. 1962. *How to do things with words*. London: Oxford University Press
- Backus, Ad. 1996. *Two in one. Bilingual speech of Turkish immigrants in the Netherlands*. Tilburg: Tilburg University Press.
- Backus, Ad. 2003. Can a mixed language be conventionalized alternational codeswitching? In Yaron Matras & Peter Bakker (eds.), *The mixed language debate: Theoretical and empirical advances*, 237–270. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Bakker, Peter. 1997. *A language of our own. The genesis of Michif, the mixed Cree-French language of the Canadian Métis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bessant, Kenneth C. 2018. *The relational fabric of community*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bialystok, Ellen. 2015. Bilingualism and the development of executive function: The role of attention. *Child Development Perspectives* 9. 117–121.
- Bialystok, Ellen, Fergus Craik, David Green & Tamar H. Gollan. 2009. Bilingual minds. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest* 10. 89–129.
- Binchy, Alice. 1993. *Shelta: An historical and contemporary analysis*. Unpublished D.Phil thesis, University of Oxford.
- Blokland, Talya. 2017. *Community as urban practice*. Cambridge, England: Polity Press.
- Blommaert, Jan & Backus, Ad. 2013. Superdiverse repertoires and the individual. In Ingrid de Saint-Georges I. & Jean-Jacques Weber (eds.), *Multilingualism and multimodality. The future of education research*, 11–32. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Brubaker, Rogers & Frederick Cooper, F. (2000). Beyond “identity”. *Theory and Society* 29(1). 1–47.
- Butler, Judith. 1990 [1999]. *Gender Trouble: feminism and the subversion of identity*. London: Routledge.
- Butler, Judith. 2010. Performative agency. *Journal of Cultural Economy* 3:2. 147–161.
- Campbell, Lyle 1993. On proposed universals of grammatical borrowing. In Henk Aertsen & R. J. Jeffers (eds.), *Historical linguistics* 1989, 91–109. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Croft, William. 2000. *Explaining language change: An evolutionary approach*. Harlow/Essex: Longman.
- Croft, William. 2003. Mixed languages and acts of identity. An evolutionary approach. In Yaron Matras & Peter Bakker (eds.), *The mixed language debate: Theoretical and empirical advances*, 41–72. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Derrida, Jacques. 1988 [1972]. Signature, event, context. In *Limited Inc.*, translated by Samuel Weber and Jeffrey Mehlman, 1–23. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.
- Elšik, Viktor & Matras, Yaron. 2006. *Markedness and language change: The Romani sample*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Field, Frederic. W. 2002. *Linguistic borrowing in bilingual contexts*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Freywald, Ulrike, Katharina Mayr, Tiner Özçelik & Heike Wiese. 2011. Kiezdeutsch as a multiethnolect. In Friederike Kern & Margret Selting (eds.), *Ethnic styles of speaking in european metropolitan areas*, 45–73. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Gardani, Francesco, Peter Arkadiev & Nino Amiridze. 2015. (eds.). *Borrowed morphology*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Golovko, Evgenij V. 1996. A case of nongenetic development in the Arctic area: The contribution of Aleut and Russian to the formation of Copper Island Aleut. In Ernst H. Jahr, E. H. & Ingvild Broch (eds.), *Language contact in the Arctic: Northern pidgins and contact languages*, 63–77. Berlin: De Gruyter.

- Golovko, Evgenij V. 2003. Language contact and group identity: The role of 'folk' linguistic engineering. In Yaron Matras & Peter Bakker (eds.), *The mixed language debate: Theoretical and empirical advances*, 177–207. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Green, David W. 1998. Mental control of the bilingual lexico-semantic system. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 1, 67–81.
- Grosjean, François. 2001. The bilingual's language modes. In: Janet L. Nicol, J. L. (ed.), *One mind, two languages. Bilingual language processing*, 1–22. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Gumperz, John. 1980. *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hancock, Ian F. 1992. The Social and Linguistic development of Scando-Romani. In Ernst H. Jahr (ed.), *Language contact: Theoretical and empirical studies*, 37–52. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Haspelmath, Martin & Tadmor, Uri (eds.). 2009. *Loanwords in the world's languages. A comparative handbook*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Heath, Jeffrey. 1984. Language contact and language change. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 13. 367–384.
- Ho-Dac, Tuc. 2002. *Vietnamese-English bilingualism. Patterns of code-switching*. London: Routledge.
- Igla, Birgit. 1996. *Das Romani von Aja Varvara. Deskriptive und historisch-vergleichende Darstellung eines Zigeunerndialekts*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Jørgensen, J. Normann. 2008. Polylingual Languageing around and among children and adolescents. *International Journal of Multilingualism* 5(3). 161–176.
- LePage, Robert and Tabouret-Keller, Andrée. 1985. Acts of identity. Creole-Based Approaches to Language and Ethnicity. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Levinson, Stephen C. 1983. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Li Wei 2018. Translanguaging as a practical theory of languages. *Applied Linguistics* 39(1). 9–30.
- Li Wei and Milroy, Lesley. 1995. Conversational codeswitching in a Chinese community in Britain: A sequential analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics* 37. 375–389.
- Maschler, Yael. 1994. Metalanguaging and discourse markers in bilingual conversation. *Language in Society* 23. 325–366.
- Matras, Yaron. 1998. Utterance modifiers and universals of grammatical borrowing. *Linguistics* 36(2). 281–331.
- Matras, Yaron. 2000a. Fusion and the cognitive basis for bilingual discourse markers. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 4(4). 505–528.
- Matras, Yaron. 2000b. Mixed Languages. A functional-communicative approach. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 3(2). 79–99.
- Matras, Yaron. 2003. Mixed languages: Re-examining the structural prototype. In Yaron Matras and Peter Bakker (eds.), *The mixed language debate: Theoretical and empirical advances*, 151–176. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Matras, Yaron. 2007. The borrowability of grammatical categories. In Yaron Matras & Jeanette Sakel (eds.), *Grammatical borrowing in cross-linguistic perspective*, 31–74. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Matras 2010. *Romani in Britain. The afterlife of a language*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Matras, Yaron. 2012. *A grammar of Domari*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

- Matras, Yaron, 2015. Why is the borrowing of inflectional morphology dispreferred? In Francesco Gardani, Peter Arkadiev, & Nino Amiridze (eds.), *Borrowed morphology*, 47–80. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Matras, Yaron. 2020. *Language contact* [second edition]. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Matras, Yaron & Bakker, Peter. 2003. The study of mixed languages. Yaron Matras and Peter Bakker (eds.), *The mixed language debate: Theoretical and empirical advances*, 1–20. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter
- Mazzoli, Maria. 2019. Michif loss and resistance in four Metis communities (Kahkiyaaw mashchineenan, “All of us are disappearing as in a plague”). *Zeitschrift für Kanada-Studien* 69. 96–117.
- McConvell, Patrick and Felicity Meakins. 2005 Gurindji Kriol: A mixed language emerges from code-switching. *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 25. 9–30.
- Meakins, Felicity. 2011. *Case marking in contact: The development and function of case morphology in Gurindji Kriol*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Melissaropoulou, Dimitra & Ralli, Angela. 2019. Revisiting the borrowability scale(s) of free grammatical elements: evidence from Modern Greek contact induced varieties. *Journal of Language Contact* 12. 707–736.
- Moravcsik, Edith. 1978. Universals of language contact. In Joseph H. Greenberg (ed.), *Universals of human language*, 94–122. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Mous, Maarten. 2003. *The making of a Mixed Language: The Case of Ma'a/Mbugu*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Mufwene, S. S. 2013. The origins and the evolution of language. In Keith Allan (ed.), *The Oxford handbook of the history of linguistics*, 13–52. Oxford University Press:
- Myers-Scotton, Carol 1993. *Duelling languages. Grammatical structure in codeswitching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Myers-Scotton, Carol. 1998. A Way to Dusty Death: The Matrix Language Turnover hypothesis. In Lenore Grenoble & Lindsay J. Whaley (eds.), *Endangered languages: Language loss and community response*, 289–316. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Myers-Scotton, Carol. 2003. What lies beneath. Split (mixed) languages as contact phenomena. In Yaron Matras & Peter Bakker (eds.), *The mixed language debate: Theoretical and empirical advances*, 73–106. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.
- O'Shannessy, Carmel. 2020. Mixed Languages. In Evangelia Adamou & Yaron Matras (eds.), *The Routledge handbook of language contact*, 325–348. London: Routledge.
- Otsuka, Hitomi, Thomas Stolz, Aina Urdze, & Martine Vanhove (eds.). 2012. *Morphologies in contact*. Berlin: Akademie.
- Pakendorf, Brigitte. 2015. *A comparison of copied morphemes in Sakha (Yakut) and Éven*. In Francesco Gardani, Peter Arkadiev & Nino Amiridze (eds.), *Borrowed morphology*, 157–187. Berlin: de Gruyter Mouton.
- Peng, Qiu Hui 2016: Intertwining Chinese words and English –ing. Unpublished manuscript. The University of Manchester.
- Pennycook, Alistair, & Otsuji, Emi. 2015. *Metrolingualism: Language in the city*. London: Routledge.
- Poplack, Shana. 1980. Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish y termino en español. *Linguistics* 18. 581–618.

- Rasenberg, Marlou, Rommers, Joost and van Bergen, Geertje. 2020. Anticipating predictability: an ERP investigation of expectation-managing discourse markers in dialogue comprehension. *Language, Cognition and Neuroscience* 35(1). 1–16.
- Sasse, Hans-Jürgen. 1992. Theory of language death. In Mathias Brenzinger (ed.), *Language death: Factual and theoretical explorations with special references to East Africa*, 7–30. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Seifart, Frank. 2017. Patterns of affix borrowing in a sample of 100 languages. *Journal of Historical Linguistics* 7:3. 389–431.
- Smith, Norval. 1995. An annotated list of creoles, pidgins, and mixed languages. In: Jacques Arends, J., Pieter Muysken & Norval Smith (eds.), *Pidgins and creoles. An introduction*, 331–374. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Stolz, Christel & Thomas Stolz 1996. Funktionswortentlehnung in Mesoamerika. Spanisch-amerindischer Sprachkontakt Hispanoindiana II. *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 49. 86–123.
- Tadmor, Uri. 2004. Function loanwords in Malay-Indonesian (and some other Southeast Asian languages). Paper presented at the Loan Word Typology Workshop, Max-Planck-Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology, Leipzig, 1–2 May 2004.
- Thomason, Sarah G. 1995. Language mixture: ordinary processes, extraordinary results. In Carmen Silva-Corvalán (ed.), *Spanish in four continents: studies in language contact and bilingualism*, 15–33. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Thomason, Sarah G. 2001. *Language contact. An introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Thomason, Sarah G. 2007. Language contact and deliberate change. *Journal of Language Contact* 1(1). 41–62.
- Thomason, Sarah G. 2015. When is the diffusion of inflectional morphology not dispreferred? In Francesco Gardani, Peter Arkadijev & Nino Amiridze (eds.), *Borrowed morphology*, 27–46. Berlin: de Gruyter Mouton.
- Thomason, Sarah G. & Daniel L. Everett. 2001. Pronoun borrowing. In Chang, Ch. et al. (eds.), *Proceedings of the twenty seventh annual meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 301–315. Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistics Society.
- Thomason, Sarah G. & Terrence Kaufman. 1988. *Language contact, creolization, and genetic linguistics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Velupillai, Viveka. 2015. *Pidgins, creoles and mixed languages. an introduction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Wallace, S. 1983. Pronouns in contact. In Frederic B. Agard, Gerald Kelley, Adam Makkai & Valerie Becker Makkai (eds.), *Essays in honor of Charles F. Hockett*, 573–589. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Walworth, Mary. 2017. Rea Rapa: A Polynesian contact language. *Journal of Language Contact* 10. 98–141.
- Whitney, W. D. 1881. On mixture in language. *Transactions of the American Philological Association (1869–1896)*, 1–26.
- Wiese, Heike. 2009. Grammatical innovation in multiethnic urban Europe: New linguistic practices among adolescents. *Lingua* 119. 782–806.
- Williams-Van Klinken, Catharina & John Hajek. 2018. Mixing numeral systems in Timor-Leste. In Antoinette Schapper (ed.), *Contact and substrate in the languages of Wallacea Part 2*, 65–94. NUSA.

