ESUKA – JEFUL 2013, 4–2: 79–98

FROM CODE-SWITCHING TO A MIXED CODE: THE ROLE OF PARENTHETICAL VERBS IN THE EMERGING POLISH-RUSSIAN MIXED CODE IN LITHUANIA

Brigita Séguis
University of Oxford

Abstract. This paper investigates the role of parenthetical verbs in the emerging Polish-Russian mixed code in Lithuania. Parenthetical verbs share many similarities with discourse markers, since both are regarded as having little or no meaning and occurring outside the syntax of the utterance. The data analysis, based on recordings of spontaneous conversations in the Polish community in Lithuania, aims to test two hypotheses with regard to Russian parenthetical verbs in order to establish whether they should be treated as lexical elements that have been "fused" into the Polish-Russian mixed code, or as instances of ad-hoc switches triggered by identifiable factors. The data reveals that both options are permitted, which in turn suggests that fusion around parenthetical verbs has been "synchronically licensed" (Matras 2000: 525), in the sense that speakers have abolished the requirement to maintain a consistent separation between the Polish and Russian systems. However, the wholesale replacement of one system by another has not taken place.

Keywords: code-switching, emerging mixed codes, parenthetical verbs, fusion, Polish, Russian.

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.12697/jeful.2013.4.2.04

1. Introduction

Over the last few decades there has been a surge of interest in the phenomena of language alternation, usually referred to as 'code-switching' (henceforth CS). Blom and Gumperz's study (1972) on *Social Meaning in Linguistic Structures* is often quoted as one of the first works that generated a wider interest in CS (Myers-Scotton 1993: 46, Gardner-Chloros 2009: 9). Their study investigates the use of two dialects of Norwegian, Bokmal (standard variety) and Ranamal (vernacular) in the town of Hemnesberget and introduces the distinction between 'situational switching' and 'metaphorical switching' (1972: 116–117). Situational switching, as the term implies, is triggered by a change in the situation, e.g. when an outsider joins a conversation between established members of the community. The underlying assumption is that only one of the varieties is appropriate for a particular

situation, which encourages speakers to adjust their language accordingly to maintain that appropriateness (1972: 116). On the other hand, metaphorical switching refers to changes in the speaker's choice when the situation remains the same. As Blom and Gumperz explain (1972: 117), "the language switch here relates to particular kinds of topics or subject matter rather than to change in social situation."

Although the dichotomy between situational and metaphorical switching has been criticized for being too vague and simplistic (Auer 1984: 91, Myers-Scotton 1993: 52), there seems to be a general consensus about the importance of the Blom and Gumperz' study. Myers-Scotton claims that despite its shortfalls, the study has had an enormous contribution towards the advancement of CS research (ibid), while Gardner-Chloros claims that "[Gumperz's] early work on CS put the latter on the sociolinguistic map" (2009: 104).

Since Blom and Gumperz's article there has been a surge of interest in CS that resulted in several theoretical frameworks developed in order to explain this phenomenon. Arguably one of the most influential models of CS is the Markedness Model (henceforth MM) proposed by Myers-Scotton (1993, 2001). One of the central premises of the MM is that speakers' language choices are based on their cognitive calculations. As Myers-Scotton and Bolonyai explain, speakers make an assessment of options that are available to them "in terms of a cost-benefit analysis that takes account of their own subjective motivations and their objective opportunities" (2001: 5). Since conversation is regarded as rational behaviour, CS can be explained by uncovering the rational intentions that motivate a selection of a particular code during interaction.

Throughout their conversational encounters participants expect from each other that certain norms and social roles established by the community will be maintained. These norms are referred to as Rights and Obligations sets (Myers-Scotton 1993: 84), and can be indexed by choosing a marked or unmarked code. The unmarked choice is regarded as "safe" because it conforms with the prevailing social norms and conventions and signals expected information. However, having assessed the potential costs and reward, speakers can opt for alternative and unexpected choices, i.e. they can make a marked choice and hence negotiate a different Rights and Obligations set for a given interaction (Myers-Scotton 2005: 85).

The critique of the MM mainly comes from the fact that it relies heavily on the conversation-external knowledge, which leads to very broad and speculative explanations of CS (Auer 1998: 8–12). Similar concerns have been expressed by Li Wei (2005: 387) who believes that the MM relies too heavily on the analyst's interpretation, rather

than a detailed analysis of how participants create meaning in the course of their conversation.

An alternative framework has been developed by Auer in his Conversation Analytic approach to CS (1984, 1998, 2001). Drawing on Gumperz's notion of 'contextualization cue' (1982: 131),[1] Auer focuses on the discourse-related functions of CS. According to Auer (1984: 5), a choice of a particular language by one of the speakers exerts an influence on subsequent language choices by the same or other speakers. It is therefore crucial to engage in a detailed turn-by-turn analysis of sequential conversation structures, for it allows the researcher to uncover the meaning behind code-switched utterances by relying on exactly the same strategy as that of the participants, i.e. turn-by-turn contextual interpretation.

The sequential approach to CS allows Auer to distinguish between two types of language alternation, 'participant-related switching' and 'discourse-related switching' (2001: 444). The former may reflect the speaker's imbalanced bilingual competence, or his preference for one language of interaction over another. The latter type of switching is conditioned by what Auer calls "conversational moves" (1984: 4), which may include clarification request, elaboration, indirect decline, reported speech or repetition. Both types of switching may be further subdivided into 'alternational' and 'insertional'. Alternational switching is characterized by a change in the base language from the switching point onwards, while in insertional switching only the required word from another code is borrowed on an ad-hoc basis before the conversation reverts to the original base code (Auer 2001: 445).

While very influential, Auer's Conversation Analytic approach has been criticized for relying too heavily on conversation-internal micro-linguistic features at the expense of the macro societal factors (Stroud 1998: 322), as well as its preoccupation with a "monolingual vision" of CS (Aucle and Barnes 2011: 108). As Aucle and Barnes (ibid) explain, "the theoretical background of constructs such as 'alternational' and 'insertional' CS is founded on the wisdom that monolingualism usually represents a desired state of proficiency that is […] legitimated by society." In other words, Auer's approach does not readily extend itself to cover such cases of switching where constant language alternation is regarded as an established norm. One way of dealing with this shortfall has been the introduction of a dichotomy between CS and code-mixing (henceforth CM), which will be discussed in the next section.

1 In one of his later works Gumperz suggests the idea of "CS as a series contextualization cues", which allow the listener "to interpret what the activity is, how semantic content is to be understood and how each sentence related to what precedes or follows it" (1982: 131).

2. Code mixing and the emergence of mixed codes

Auer himself has acknowledged that "there are many phenomena of language contact other than CS which for the linguist may represent cases of the juxtaposition of two language varieties, but not for the bilingual speaker. One such case of language contact […] is 'code-mixing', or the emergence of a mixed code" (1998: 15). He goes on to specify that CM is characterised by "numerous and frequent cases of alternation between two languages when seen from the linguist's point of view, but these singular occurrences of alternation do not carry meaning *qua* language choice for the bilingual participants" (Auer 1998: 16).

In characterising a middle position on the continuum between CS and an emerging mixed code, Auer (1998: 16–21) has identified several steps. The first step involves numerous and frequent cases of discourse-related switches which do not change the language of interaction. In a prototypical case of alternational CS, a switch would entail a new language of interaction form the switching point onwards. However, in an emerging mixed code the preference for one language of interaction is relinquished, i.e. turn-internal switches have no consequence on the level of language choice. The second move towards a mixed code is characterized by the frequent use of borrowings, which are usually content words. Auer further adds that discourse markers from one of the codes involved in CM are often embedded into conversations in the other code. Such instances should also be included in the category of single-word borrowings that contribute to the formation of mixed codes (1998: 17).

Auer's remark about the role of discourse markers in emerging mixed codes closely echoes the works of Matras (1998, 2000) who offers yet another view on language switching at discourse markers centred around the notion of "fusion", which refers to the wholesale, class-specific non-separation of two systems (2000: 511). In communities where bilingualism has become the norm, speakers may over time adopt just one set of particular linguistic structures, thus entirely eliminating or partially reducing the need to select among competing word-forms. This is usually the case when discourse marking items are involved. According to Matras (2000: 516) discourse markers are elements that help speakers monitor and direct the way a propositional content of the utterance is processed and accepted by the hearer. The monitoring and directing operations are cognitively more complex than formulating propositional content, for the latter involve back-processing, planning ahead, anticipating and controlling reactions, interpreting gestures and intervening with a possible undesired course

of processing on the part of the speaker (Matras 2000: 517). Therefore, bilingual speakers will aim to reduce this cognitive load by eliminating the choice between the two systems available at their disposal.

Fusion may have both synchronic and diachronic manifestations. In the case of synchronic manifestation, different-language variants of the same variable may be used side by side. Matras exemplifies this with the case of Low German speakers in the United States who constantly alternate between Low German connectors *und*, *aber* and their English counterparts *and*, *but* (2000: 524). The fact that English connectors frequently appear in Low German conversations suggests that speakers have accepted them as part of the available inventory of forms, thus partially eliminating the need to maintain the separation between the two systems. Although full replacement of one system by another has not taken place yet, it is nevertheless "synchronically licensed", i.e. speakers have abolished the requirement to maintain a consistent separation between the Low German and the English system (Matras 2000: 525). It is of course possible that over time English forms will take over at the expense of their Low German counterparts, leading to a complete replacement, which would then be treated as a diachronic manifestation of fusion.

A mixed mode of speaking, which involves frequent alternation between the local variety of Polish and Russian seems to be emerging in the Polish community in Lithuania. This paper offers an excerpt from the on-going research and focuses specifically on the category of parenthetical verbs, which are very closely related to discourse markers. My previous analysis of particles acting as discourse markers in the same corpus has revealed that Russian *nu* ('well'), and *vot* ('there', 'here') have been "fused" into the Polish-Russian mixed code with a full range of functions that they normally perform in Standard Russian, thus completely eliminating any immediate equivalents from Polish. This suggests that their employment in the mixed code can be classified as a diachronic manifestation of fusion, i.e. the wholesale replacement of the Polish particles by their Russian equivalents has already taken place (Séguis forthcoming). The aim of the present paper is therefore to establish whether this observation can be extended to include parenthetical verbs (henceforth PV). The following questions will be addressed:

(i) What is the distribution of Polish and Russian PVs in the present data?
(ii) Does the insertion of a Russian PV trigger further switching in the base language of the utterance?

(iii) What pragmatic functions do Russian PVs perform in the contexts in which they appear?

The paper is organized as follows: section 3 provides a brief overview of the social and linguistic situation in the Polish community; section 4 briefly outlines the data and methodology; section 5 contains data analysis and discussion, while conclusions can be found in section 6.

3. The Polish community in Lithuania

The Polish community can be described as an autochtonous ethnic group that has been living on the territory of modern-day Lithuania since as far back as the 14th century (Potašenko 2007: 13). Historically, the number of Poles varied during different periods. The first significant influx of the Polish population to the Grand Duchy of Lithuania was recorded between 1569 and 1795, which coincides with the period of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth (Krzywicki 2005: 91). The Polish community continued to grow steadily throughout the 19th and first half of the 20th century. However, as a result of the change of borders after World War II, a great number of Poles moved back to Poland and the ones who remained in Lithuania became an ethnic minority in a foreign country (Krzywicki 2005: 94).

As Hogan-Brun and Ramonienė (2005: 354) explain, the Lithuanian Poles are "either descendants of ethnic Lithuanian families who were Polonised during the long-term union with Poland (1569–1795) or later […], or else they are from Polish families who have been resident for generations." The point to be made here is that notwithstanding the origins, Poles represent a historically rooted indigenous ethnic group with a long-established presence on the territory of modern-day Lithuania.

Concentrated in the city of Vilnius, as well as the Vilnius and Šalčininkai regions, the Polish community today makes up the largest ethnic group in the country, which according to the 2011 Population and Housing Census consists of 210, 600 inhabitants (6.6% of the entire population). According to Juozeliūnienė (1997: 200), Poles living in Lithuania are keen to preserve their cultural and linguistic independence, and are therefore unwilling to integrate with the Lithuanian majority. The majority of Poles choose Polish-medium schools for their children, which may have an impact on their state-language proficiency. Hogan-Brun and Ramonienė (2005: 354) claim that "Polish pupils are for the most part sufficiently conversant with

the state language to continue their studies in Lithuanian high schools"; however, their "level of educational achievement actually tends to be lower" (ibid). When describing the socio-demographic situation of the Polish community, Hogan-Brun and Ramonienė note that "[Poles] occupy lower social positions, the greater percentage of them being manual workers, and most of them live in the country" (2002: 37).

The linguistic situation in the Polish community is rather complex, which can be attributed to several socio-political developments. In the last 70 years Lithuanian Poles have been affected by two powerful language ideologies, Russification (Hogan-Brun and Ramonienė 2002: 29) and Lithuanisation (Chodakiewicz 2012: 424). On the one hand, cultural Sovietization and linguistic Russification were aimed at assimilating the occupied nations and ensuring the domination of the Russian language, while on the other, Lithuanisation was meant to counteract the previous prevalence of Russian by introducing Lithuanian as the dominant language (ibid). As a result of these language ideologies, Lithuanian Poles developed complex linguistic repertoires, consisting of two varieties of Polish (regional and standard), Russian and Lithuanian.

It should be noted that the regional variety of Polish, usually referred to as "the Vilnius dialect" (in Polish *Dialekt Wileński*) is significantly different from Standard Polish (cf. Grek-Pabisowa and Maryniakowa 1999, Kurzowa 1993). An in-depth overview of the Vilnius dialect along with its characteristic features would go beyond the scope of this paper, but it should be noted that the term "Polish" will be employed here as a shortcut label to refer to the variety of Polish spoken in Lithuania, and not Standard Polish.

4. Data and methods

The co-existence of several varieties in the linguistic repertoires of the Polish community has led to an emergence of regular language alternation. To investigate this phenomenon in greater detail, recordings of spontaneous naturally occurring conversations involving members of the Polish community in their early twenties were carried out in the city of Vilnius. The recordings were also supplemented by questionnaires, which were distributed in order to obtain information about the participants' proficiency in Polish, Russian and Lithuanian, as well as the domains in which each of the languages is employed (e.g. home, work, family, friends). The data obtained from the questionnaires merely serves to ensure consistency across the linguistic

profiles of the participants and will not feature directly in the data analysis.

The analysis presented in this paper is based on the corpus of recordings made during the first stage of data collection that was carried out in Vilnius in September 2011 and features 11 speakers with a mean age of 23.5. The corpus contains a total of 57,339 words, out of which 12,018 were Russian words (21% of the corpus). The concept of "social network", which can be defined as the web-like pattern of relationships among individuals (Daming et al. 2008: 262), has been employed as the main method of data collection. The use of social networks as a methodological tool has several advantages. First, it allows the researcher to identify pre-existing groups of speakers with an established history of prolonged communication, which suggests that linguistic behaviour of the participants is more natural and spontaneous. Moreover, by using the group dynamics, a researcher can obtain larger amounts of spontaneous speech. Secondly, it offers a possibility of dealing with variation between individual speakers, rather than between groups constructed with reference to predetermined social categories (Milroy 1987).

The recordings were then transcribed following the Conversation Analysis (CA) methodological approach, in particular the transcription conventions proposed by Atkinson and Heritage (1984). Following this methodological approach, transcription involves writing down as closely as possible not only the actual words uttered by the speakers, but also such additional information as precise beginning and endpoints of turns, duration of pauses, overlapping segments of speech, as well as audible sounds other than words (breathiness, laughter) (Hutchby and Wooffitt 2008: 71).

5. Data analysis

The data obtained from the recordings has displayed frequent and regular alternation between the local variety of Polish and Russian (in fewer cases – Lithuanian), which raises the question whether this frequent and regular switching pattern can be regarded as a case of an emerging mixed code. As stated in the Introduction, switching at discourse markers can be regarded as one of the characteristic features of emerging mixed codes. But before analysing specific examples of Russian PVs in the present data, the concepts of a 'discourse marker' and a 'parenthetical verb' need to be defined in greater detail.

5.1. Discourse markers and parenthetical verbs

The category of PVs is closely related to that of discourse markers, which following Schiffrin (1987: 31) can be defined as "sequentially dependent elements that bracket units of talk". One of the main difficulties relating to the category of discourse markers is a great inventory of forms that it is said to include and the multitude of functions that they are supposed to fulfil. Some of the lexical items usually ascribed to this category include interjections (*oh*), adverbs (*well*), verbs (*you know*), coordinate and subordinate conjunctions (*and, but*), phrases (*do you see what I mean*), and even entire sentence fragments and clauses. What unites them under one class of lexical items is their "functional similarities and partially overlapping distributions" (Schiffrin 1987: 65), i.e. these items share some of the basic features, but rarely (if ever) all of them. From the semantic point of view, they are regarded as having little or no meaning, while from the syntactic point of view, discourse markers are described as occurring outside the syntax of the utterance, and thus having no well-defined grammatical function (Brinton 1996: 32–35).

The group of lexical items that will be analysed in the present paper could be described as "verbs acting as discourse markers". However, in the existing research tradition they are normally referred to as "parenthetical verbs" and are treated as a sub-category of parentheticals. Just like discourse markers, the class of parentheticals can be described as a group of lexical items that are morphologically and syntactically disparate, and that, in the most general sense, can be defined as expressions that are linearly represented in a given string of utterance (a host sentence), but remain structurally independent at the same time (Dehé and Kavalova 2007: 1).

One of the first explicit definitions of PVs was proposed by Urmson (1952: 491), who claims that PVs include such forms as *suppose*, *know*, *believe*, which are used in the first person present tense and which, contrary to the generally held belief, do not describe "goings-on". He further specifies that they may occur in the initial, medial or final position in a sentence and indicate to the listener how he or she should interpret the proposition (ibid).

While Urmson (1952) limited PVs to the first person forms, Grenoble (2004: 1969–1970) proposes to include second person present tense forms under the same label. She further explains that first person forms serve to indicate the speaker's subjective stance, while second person forms are directed at the addressee. As such, they may be used to elicit a verbal or non-verbal response from the addressee, to check

if the addressee agrees with what has been said, or to draw the addressee's attention and keep them involved in the conversation (ibid).

In Russian linguistic tradition the category that is most closely related to the category of parentheticals, and in particular PVs, is that of 'introductory words' (*vvodnye slova*). *Vvodnye slova* are used to supply metatextual information that is additional to what is contained in the main body of a sentence (Švedova 2005: 228). The metatextual information may include the speaker's attitude towards what is being said, or additional characteristics of the message being expressed. From the point of view of grammatical organisation, this group is very diverse. It is said to include conjugated forms of the verb (i.e. PVs), as well as infinitives, adverbs, adverbial participles, nouns, pronouns, and idioms. Although they are called "introductory", *vvodnye slova* may occur anywhere within a sentence and can be easily inserted or extracted without affecting its syntax (ibid).

The characteristics outlined above show a great overlap with those attributed to discourse markers. A great similarity between the two categories has also been noted by Grenoble (2004: 1959), who says that "because parentheticals are seen as giving signals to the addressee as to how to interpret an utterance, they are often likened to discourse markers", further adding that "some of what the [Russian] Academy Grammar calls *vvodnye slova* would be called discourse markers by others". However, she suggests to maintain the two lexical groups separate, with the term 'discourse marker' reserved "for those entities such as [the Russian] *nu* 'well', *že* [emphatic particle] – the so-called discourse particles – which lack lexical content" (Grenoble 2004: 1959). What is probably the biggest advantage of referring to forms like *podozhdi* – 'wait'-IMP.2SG and *znaesh'* – 'know'-PRS.2SG as PVs rather than 'verbs acting as discourse markers' is that this term immediately connects them with the existing body of literature, which does not seem to exist with the regard to the latter.

Bearing the above discussion in mind, it is now possible to formulate a working definition for the Russian forms of the verb that will be analysed in the present paper:

> *Parenthetical verbs can be defined as inflected forms of verbs that can occur in the first person present tense declarative form, second person present tense declarative or interrogative, as well as the imperative, with or without an accompanying pronominal subject. Although based on a finite verb, parenthetical verbs do not contribute to the propositional content of the utterance, and may perform a range of discourse-related functions, such as involving the addressee in the conversation or relinquishing/taking the floor.*

Parenthetical verbs occur outside the syntax of the utterance, and can therefore be detached from the main constituents of the sentence without rendering it ungrammatical.

The purpose of this working definition is to provide a concise description of PVs which would help to decide what lexical items should be included in this category, and to eliminate borderline cases in order to achieve a maximal uniformity.

5.2. Parenthetical verbs in the present corpus

It should be noted at the very outset that there is a strong qualitative and quantitative contrast between Russian PV's on the one hand, and discourse particles like *nu* ('well'), and *vot* ('there', 'here') on the other hand. Not only do Russian PVs occur alongside Polish PVs, the latter are significantly more frequent than the former. While there were 6 Polish and 7 Russian PVs that appeared in the corpus, their quantitative distribution was far from equal: Polish PVs were employed on 659 instances, as opposed to only 30 instances for Russian PVs. Moreover, Russian PVs are much more ideolectal, i.e. they appear in the discourse of 5 speakers, unlike *nu* and *vot* that were distributed more or less equally throughout the corpus and appeared in significant quantities (1539 instances of *nu* and 710 instances of *vot*) (Séguis forthcoming). Although in quantitative terms Russian PVs are not as significant as *nu* and *vot*, their presence in the corpus suggests that they start encroaching into the Polish base in the discourse of some speakers, and a closer analysis of these items might provide additional insight into language mixing around discourse markers.

Table 1 presents a detailed quantitative distribution of each PV that appeared in the data with regard to individual speakers.

Table 1. distribution of parenthetical verbs across speakers

Parenthetical Verb	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**	**F**	**J**	**K1**	**K2**	**L**	**M**	**N**
[PL] *wi-esz* know-PRS.2SG	176	136	-	71	1	-	16	14	15	19	3	4
[PL]*rozumi-esz* understand-PRS.2SG	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	1	-	-
[PL]*(po)czek-aj* wait-IMP.2SG	17	8	-	4	-	1	-	2	3	5	7	7

Parenthetical Verb	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**	**F**	**J**	**K1**	**K2**	**L**	**M**	**N**
[PL] *słuch-aj* listen-IMP.2SG	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-
[PL] *widz-isz* see-PRS.2SG	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
[PL] *mówi-a* tell-PRS.1SG	79	1	-	38	-	-	1	-	4	8	-	1
[RUS] *znaesh'* know-PRS.2SG	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6
[RUS] *podozhdi* wait-IMP.2SG	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
[RUS] *slushaj* listen-IMP.2SG	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
[RUS] *prikin'* imagine-IMP.2SG	-	-	-	5	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-
[RUS] *predstavljaesh'* imagine-PRS.2SG	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
[RUS] *soglasis'* agree-IMP.2SG	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
[RUS] *dopustim* suppose-IMP.1PL	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	-

The table further demonstrates that Russian PVs appear in the discourse of speakers A, D, M and N, as well as speakers K1 and L but to a lesser extent. Polish PVs, on the other hand, were employed by virtually all speakers in the data and are more significant in terms of numbers. This observation suggests that the use of a Polish PV would constitute the default choice for most speakers, which in turn raises the question of what triggers the insertion of a Russian PV. One of the factors that may lead to the employment of a Russian lexical item is the presence of other Russian language elements, which suggests that a Russian PV would normally appear as part of a multiple switch, i.e. a larger stretch of Russian discourse rather than on its own. This line of reasoning leads to two hypotheses that will be tested against the present data: (1) if Russian PV's are embedded into a Russian stretch of discourse consisting of at least one other item before the PV, then the insertion of a Russian PV could be attributed to the presence of other Russian elements. It would also mean that the choice between a

Polish and a Russian PV is purely contextual. (2) if Russian PV's appear as stand-alone items in an otherwise Polish base and do not trigger further switching, then they can be regarded as lexical items that have been fused into the discourse of some speakers and can be used alongside the Polish PVs. Should the second hypothesis prove to be true, one may assume that we are dealing with a synchronic manifestation of fusion around PVs, where some of the speakers do not demand from themselves to undertake a consistent separation of the Polish and Russian systems.

A closer look at the data shows that both options are in fact possible, although the employment of a Russian PV in a Russian stretch is the prevailing one. The implications of the findings with regard to the two hypotheses being tested will be discussed in greater detail in the following subsections. A brief summary of the quantified findings can be found in Table 2 below.

Table 2. Russian parenthetical verbs and their position in the sentence.

Parenthetical Verb	**Part of Russian Stretch**	**1st item**	**2nd, middle, last item**	**Stand-alone item**	**Turn-initial**
[RUS] *znaesh'* know-PRS.2SG	**9**	3	6	**2**	-
[RUS] *podozhdi* wait-IMP.2SG	**2**	-	2	**3**	1
[RUS] *slushaj* listen-IMP.2SG	**1**	1	-	**-**	-
[RUS] *prikin'* imagine-IMP.2SG	**2**	1	1	**4**	2
[RUS] *predstavljaesh'* imagine-PRS.2SG	**-**	-	-	**1**	-
[RUS] *soglasis'* agree-IMP.2SG	**1**	-	1	**-**	-
[RUS] *dopustim* suppose-IMP.1PL	**3**	1	2	**2**	-
TOTAL	**18**			**12**	

5.3. Russian PV's in Russian Stretches of Discourse

The main aim of this subsection is to establish whether the presence of other language elements may trigger the insertion of a Russian PV. The opposite scenario, i.e. whether the appearance of a Russian PV triggers switching in the lexical elements that follow it will also be considered. Judging from the initial quantification presented in Table 2, both possibilities appear to be permitted. In 6 out of 18 instances, Russian PV's have occurred as the first element of a larger stretch of Russian discourse, which allows to suppose that the Russian PV itself triggered further switching. A few illustrative examples have been provided in (1) and (2):

(1) nie (.) [RUS] *ty dolzh-en* od-pracować (.) [RUS] *zna-esh'*
no (.) you must-PRS.2SG off-work-IMP know-PRS.2SG
blin koroche
damn briefer
'no (.) you must work off (.) briefly speaking damn it you know'

The Russian PV *znaesh'* appears in the turn-final position along with the swearword *blin* and another discourse marker *koroche*. It is reasonable to assume that it was the presence of a PV that triggered the insertion of further elements from Russian. A similar observation can be made with regard to example (2):

(2) = I on lepiej pali sie (.)[RUS] *dopust-im* *esli*
= and he better burn- PRS.3SG (.) suppose– IMP.1PL if
normalnie wziąść […]
normally take-INF […]
'and it burns better (.) suppose if [one] simply takes […]'

The example above contains another cluster consisting of a Russian PV and a switched item *esli*, whose employment on this particular occasion could have been triggered by the presence of the PV.

However, there appears to be a problem with the switches that were supposedly triggered by the insertion of a Russian PV. What undermines the hypothesis that Russian PVs trigger further switching in the lexical elements that immediately follow them is the fact that *blin*, *koroche* and *esli* have all appeared as single switches (as well as parts of larger Russian stretches) in the conversations of the same, and sometimes also other speakers in the corpus. Speaker N employed the discourse marker *koroche* on 40 occasions, while *blin* on as many as 50 occasions. Similarly, speaker M has employed the conjunction *esli*

on 9 occasions. This suggests that these items are stored in the speakers' mental lexicons and belong to the inventory of forms that can be easily retrieved and combined with other lexical items. Although it is possible to conclude that the presence of a Russian lexical item has in some way facilitated the employment of another Russian lexical item, it cannot be categorically assumed that Russian PVs trigger further switching in the elements that immediately follow them. The switches that appeared in (1) and (2), as well as other examples of this kind that can be found in the corpus are all limited to two or three items only, and never spread throughout the rest of the turn. Moreover, the lexical items affected by the switch into Russian did occur on other occasions, often as stand-alone items in a Polish base, which suggests that they do not necessitate a trigger in order to be employed in the speakers' discourse.

As Table 2 demonstrates, there were also 12 instances in the data when a Russian PV was embedded within a larger Russian stretch in a position other than initial. In 4 out of 12 cases, the PV was preceded by a discourse marker, in 2 cases by the discourse particle *vot* ('here', 'there'), in 3 cases by the swearword *bljad'* ('whore') and once by the conjunction *esli* ('if'). Incidentally, these lexical items are very similar to the ones that appeared right after a Russian PV in the two previous extracts. An example of *esli* before a PV can be found in (3):

(3) wtedy jak? (.)[RUS] *esli* *dopust-im* skończy sie ta
then how? (.) if suppose– IMP.1PL run out-INF this-NOM.SG
karteczka =
card-NOM.SG
'then how? (.) suppose if this [credit] card expires='

Extract (3) is very similar to (2), for it contains a cluster of exactly the same Russian lexical elements, the PV *dopustim* and *esli*. The only difference is the order in which they appear. The fact that the two lexical elements can be easily swapped around further reinforces the view that it is not the PV that triggers the insertion of *esli*, nor is it *esli* that triggers the insertion of a PV. The fact that a Russian element is already present in the discourse may of course facilitate the insertion of another Russian element, but does not necessitate it, for both lexical items can also appear on their own in a Polish base. In fact, the examples that are present in the corpus are ambiguous since the Russian PV is immediately followed by lexical items that were employed very frequently as single switches in a Polish base. This observation undermines the hypothesis that Russian PVs trigger switching in the adjacent lexical items. It is therefore suggested that the insertion of a

Russian PV may facilitate the insertion of several other lexical items from Russian, but this hypothesis requires further testing against additional data.

5.4. Russian PV's as single switches

The aim of this subsection is to assess the evidence for the second hypothesis, which states that if Russian PV's can appear as stand-alone items in an otherwise Polish base and do not trigger further switching, then they can be regarded as lexical items that have been fused into the discourse of some speakers and can be used alongside the Polish PVs. Out of 30 instances of Russian PVs in the present corpus, there were 12 instances of stand-alone insertions into a Polish base that did not trigger further switching in the language of the utterance, be it in the beginning of the utterance, in the middle or in turn-final positions.

Extracts (4), (5) and (6) contain examples of stand-alone Russian PV's in three different positions within a turn. Their appearance in each of these positions does not exert any influence on the language of the rest of the turn:

(4) [RUS] *ty prikin'* teraz na kałonce *koroche* […]
you imagine- IMP.2SG now on gas-station-LOC.SG shorter
'[can] you imagine now at the gas-station […]'

Apart from *koroche*, which was employed as a single switch very frequently throughout the corpus, the base language of turn (4) remains Polish despite the use of *ty prikin'* in the turn-initial position. The insertion of a Russian PV with its accompanying pronoun does not trigger switching in the remaining part of the utterance.

(5) [RUS] *nu* bo jeden [RUS] *zakaz* to dobrze jak
well because one-NOM.SG order- NOM.SG it good when
blisko [RUS] *znaesh*-'
close know- PRS.2SG
'well because it [is] good when one order [is] close you know –'

- ale jak gdzieś tam […]
- but when somewhere there […]
'but when [it] is somewhere there […]'

In the above example, the Russian PV *znaesh'* appears in the middle of the utterance, where it is embedded in a Polish base and its insertion does not entail further switching.

(6) N: nie tak jeszcze kodu nie mogli zrobić
no thus more code- GEN.SG not can-PST.3PL make-INF
predstavljaesh'?
imagine- PRS.2SG
'no but [what] more [they] couldn't do the code, [can you] imagine?'

M: jakiego kodu?
what- GEN.SG code- GEN.SG
'what code?'

The Russian PV *predstavljaesh'* is inserted at the end of an entirely Polish turn, but its presence does not exert an influence on the language of the following turn, which proceeds in Polish.

The three examples illustrated above, as well as the remaining nine instances of stand-alone Russian PVs demonstrate that it is acceptable for a Russian PV to appear on its own in a Polish base without causing further switching. This observation provides some evidence for the second hypothesis, which suggests that in the discourse of some speakers, Russian PVs have been fused into the emerging Polish-Russian mixed code. The fact that Polish and Russian PVs are used side by side (though in very disproportionate distribution) suggests that we are dealing with a synchronic manifestation of fusion. The full replacement of one system by another has not taken place yet, and judging from the numbers, Polish PVs still very much prevail. As extracts (1)–(3) demonstrate, Russian PVs primarily occur in clusters with other Russian lexical items, which have a well-established presence in the corpus and could in theory facilitate the insertion of another Russian lexical item. However, extracts (4)–(6) show that some speakers find it acceptable to use Russian PVs as single switches in a Polish base. In this sense, fusion around PVs can be described "synchronically licensed" (Matras 2000: 525) in the sense that speakers have abolished the requirement to maintain a consistent separation between the Polish and Russian systems.

6. Conclusions

This paper focused on Russian PVs that can be found in an emerging Polish-Russian mixed code in Lithuania. The six examples that were discussed in greater detail have shown that the insertion of a

Russian PV into a Polish-language base does not trigger switching neither in the remaining part of the utterance, nor in the subsequent utterances; however, it may facilitate insertion of other Russian lexical elements. The data analysed so far suggests that only in the discourse of some speakers the non-separation of Polish and Russian systems with regard to PVs is permitted. Further data analysis is required in order to verify this further.

Address:
Brigita Séguis
Centre for Linguistics and Philology
University of Oxford
Walton Street
Oxford OX1 2HG
United Kingdom
E-mail: brigita.seguis@hertford.ox.ac.uk

References

Alvarez-Caccamo, Celso (1998) "From 'switching code' to 'code-switching': towards a reconceptualization of communicative codes". In Peter Auer, ed. *Code-switching in conversation: language, interaction, and identity*, 29–48. London: Routledge.

Aucle, Tejshree and Lawrie Barnes (2011) "Code-switching, language mixing and fused lects: emerging trends in multilingual Mauritius". *Language Matters: Studies in the Languages of Africa* 42, 1, 104–125.

Auer, Peter (1984) *Bilingual conversation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins

Auer, Peter (1998) "Introduction: bilingual conversation revisited". In: Peter Auer, ed. *Code-switching in conversation*, 1–24. London: Routledge.

Auer, Peter (2001) "Code-switching: discourse models". In *Concise encyclopedia of sociolinguistics*. New York: Elsevier.

Blom, Jan-Peter and John Gumperz (1972) "Social meaning in linguistic structures: code switching in Northern Norway." In John Gumperz and Dell Hymes, eds. *Directions in sociolinguistics: the ethnography of communication*, 407–434. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Bolonayai, Agnès and Carol Myers-Scotton (2001) "Calculating speakers: code-switching in a rational choice model". *Language in Society* 30, 1–28.

Brinton, Laurel (1996) *Pragmatic markers in English: grammaticalization and discourse functions*. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Chodakiewicz, Marek (2012) *Intermarium: the land between the Black and Baltic Seas*. Transaction Publishers.

Nicole Dehé and Yordanka Kavalova (2007) “Parentheticals: an introduction”. In Nicole Dehé and Yordanka Kavalova, eds. *Parentheticals*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Gardner-Chloros, Penelope (2009) *Code switching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Grek-Pabisowa, Iryda and Irena Maryniakowa (1999) *Współczesne gwary polskie na dawnych kresach północno-wschodnich*. Warszawa: Instytut Sławistyki.

Grenoble, Lenore (2004) “Parentheticals in Russian”. *Journal of Pragmatics* 36, 11, 1953–1974.

Gumperz, John (1982) *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hogan-Brun, Gabriele and Meilutė Ramonienė (2002) “Emerging language and education policies in Lithuania”. *Language Policy* 2, 27–45.

Hogan-Brun, Gabriele and Meilutė Ramonienė (2005) “The language situation in Lithuania”. *Journal of Baltic Studies* 36, 3, 345–370.

Hutchby, Ian and Robin Wooffitt (2008) *Conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Jucker, Andreas H. and Ziv, Yael (1998) “Discourse markers: introduction”. In Andreas H Jucker and Yael Ziv, eds. *Discourse markers: descriptions and theory*, 1–12. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Kurzowa, Zofia (1993) *Język polski wileńszczyzny i kresów pólnocno-wschodnich xvi–xx.* Warsaw: PWN.

Krzywicki, Tomasz (2005) *Litwa: przewodnik.* Pwuszkow: Rewasz.

Li Wei (2005) “How can you tell? Towards a common sense explanation of conversational code-switching”. *Journal of Pragmatics* 37, 3, 375–389.

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

Matras, Yaron (2000) “Fusion and the cognitive basis for bilingual discourse markers”. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 4, 4, 505–528.

Milroy, Lesley (1987) *Observing and analysing natural language: a critical account of sociolinguistic method*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Myers-Scotton, Carol (1993) *Social motivations for code-switching: evidence from Africa*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Myers-Scotton, Carol (2005) *Multiple voices: an introduction to bilingualism*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Potašenko, Grigorijus (2007) *Lietuvos tautinės mažumos*. Kaunas: Šviesa.

Schiffrin, Deborah (1987) *Discourse markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Švedova, Natalija Jul’evna, ed. (2005) *Russkaja grammatika*. Moscow: RAN.

Stroud, Christopher (1998) “Perspectives on cultural variability of discourse and some implications for code-switching.” In Peter Auer, ed. *Code-switching in conversation: language, interaction and identity*, 321–348. London: Routledge.

Urmson, James (1952) “Parenthetical verbs”. *Mind* 61, 244, 480–496.

Xu Daming, Wang Xiaomei, and Li Wei (2008) “Social network analysis”. In *The Blackwell guide to research methods in bilingualism and multilingualism*, 263–274. Oxford: Blackwell.

Kokkuvõte. Brigita Séguis: Koodivahetusest segakoodini: parenteetiliste verbide roll Leedu poola-vene segakoodis. Artikkel käsitleb parenteetiliste verbide rolli Leedus kasutatavas poola-vene segakoodis. Parenteetilised verbid sarnanevad diskursusemarkeritele, kuna mõlemad kannavad vähe tähendust (või ka üldse mitte), esinedes väljaspool lausungi süntaksit. Analüüs põhineb Leedus elava poola kogukonna spontaanse kõne lindistustel. Vastust püütakse leida küsimusele, kas vene keele parenteetilised verbid on saanud osaks poola-vene segakoodist, või on tegemist üksikute üleminekutega, mille põhjustajad peaksid keeles eristatavad olema. Andmetest selgub, et mõlemad variandid on võimalikud, millest võib järeldada, et kõnelejad ei tee enam selget vahet poola ja vene keele parenteetiliste süsteemide vahel, ent pole ka täielikult asendanud üht süsteemi teisega.

Märksõnad: koodivahetus, keelte segunemine, tärkavad segakoodid, parenteetilised verbid, koodide ähmastumine, poola keel, vene keel