

AperTO - Archivio Istituzionale Open Access dell'Università di Torino

The road to fusion. The evolution of bilingual speech across three generations of speakers.

This is the author's manuscript

Original Citation:

Availability:

This version is available <http://hdl.handle.net/2318/1689815> since 2019-02-04T17:18:22Z

Terms of use:

Open Access

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

(Article begins on next page)

The road to fusion. The evolution of bilingual speech across three generations of speakers.

0. Introduction

In this paper I will rely on the theoretical framework for the study of bilingual speech provided by Auer (1999, 2014) and Auer & Hakimov (this issue). The crucial point in this perspective is the idea that code-switching, intended as a conversational strategy used to contextualise pragmatic and interpersonal values of verbal interaction, may lose its original pragmatic connotation and give rise to more conventionalised forms of bilingual speech. Recently, research on mixed languages has provided support to this view, showing that several fully fledged mixed languages have actually arisen from the sedimentation of code-switching patterns (see Schaengold 2004 on bilingual Navajo, Meakins 2012 on Gurindji Kriol and O'Shannessy 2004, 2012 on Light Warlpiri). This process is referred to as fusion. Here, I will concentrate on its initial stage, by describing a situation in which bilingual talk has not fully become monolingual (to recall the title of Auer 1999), but particular bilingual patterns already show some degree of conventionalisation¹.

The analysis is focussed on English-Spanish code-mixing in Gibraltar. In order to demonstrate that there is fusion in bilingual speech, I consider bilingual patterns involving different types of clause-peripheral elements. Previous studies on fused lects have focussed on insertional code-mixing (Muysken 2000) and on fusion involving clause-internal material, while alternation has often been considered not compatible with this process, due to its high unpredictability. On the contrary, my claim is that the sedimentation that leads to fusion may also be found in alternational code-mixing, particularly in the domain of discourse organisation. Furthermore, I will identify a relation between the emergence of fusion in bilingual speech and the process of language shift from Spanish to English that is currently taking place, especially amongst the younger generations (see Kellermann 2001, Levey 2008).

In Section 1, I will discuss the major macro-sociolinguistic features of the community, paying particular attention to the evolution of the linguistic repertoire. This will provide the main key for the interpretation of the dynamics of bilingual speech. In Section 2, I will concentrate on the structural aspects of fusion, identifying diagnostic features that are characteristic of this situation. Lastly, in Section 3, I will analyse the social factors that favour the emergence of fused lects, discussing the relation between language shift at a community level and ongoing fusion.

1. Bilingual speech in Gibraltar

Gibraltar is a small peninsula in southern Andalusia covering nearly 7 square kilometres. The presence of English here dates back to the beginning of the 18th century, when the Anglo-Dutch military forces conquered the Rock because of its role as a strategic outpost in the Mediterranean. British occupation was ratified by the Treaty of Utrecht, and Gibraltar has been part of the British Overseas Territories ever since. This event profoundly changed the socio-political setting of Gibraltar: while most of the Spaniards, who were the original inhabitants of the Rock, fled to the neighbouring Spanish cities during the war, the English rulers favoured the arrival of new ethnic communities. According to the first census available (see data discussed in Levey 2008: Ch. 2), the most numerous were the Sephardic Jews, who returned to Europe from the Moroccan communities

they had settled in after the Spanish *Reconquista*, and the Genoese, coming from a confined area of North-Western Italy. Thus, alongside English, which has been since then the sole official language of Gibraltar, several other languages were present on the Rock. Traces of this initial phase of widespread multilingualism are found not only in historical documents (see Levey 2008: Ch. 2 for an overview), but also in descriptions of the linguistic history of Gibraltar, as well as in local amateur dictionaries and folk-linguistic works, such as Cavilla (1978) and Vallejo (2001). However, the original in-group heritage languages were progressively abandoned in favour of a more stable Spanish-English bilingualism (see Kellermann 2001: 86-100 and Toso 2000, 2004 for the case of Genoese). Conversely, according to Kramer (1986, 1998), Spanish was maintained for a long time as the main language of communication due to the intense relations with Spain, even if the Spaniards living in Gibraltar were a minority in the XVIII century.

A reconstruction of the linguistic repertoire of the whole community is chiefly important to achieve a better understanding of the phenomena that are observed nowadays. As discussed in Gorla (2018) three main stages can be identified. In the first period of British rule, the repertoire in Gibraltar was characterised by the introduction of English as an *exoglossic standard* (Auer 2005): in fact, this was the sole official language admitted by the colonial regulations. However, except for the British citizens, the population had different L1s and daily used other languages that in some cases also enjoyed a certain prestige. This is the case for example of the Ligurian community from northern Italy, which represented a major part of Gibraltarian society and retained Genoese as its heritage language until the end of XIX century (see Toso 2000, 2004). Furthermore, an intermediate pole can be identified between English and the various ethnic languages, represented by local Spanish. This soon acquired a broader functional domain in that it was not only the in-group language of the (originally small) Spanish community, but also had the status of a *lingua franca* used in communication between different ethnic groups. Therefore, the repertoire may be represented with a tripartite structure, according to the model of *triglossia* (see Berruto 1995): this is typical of multilingual communities where H is the official standard language, L is the in-group language of an ethnic minority and M, even without having any official status, has a broader diffusion and some degree of standardisation,ⁱⁱ as indicated in the chart in Figure 1.

<PLEASE INSERT HERE FIGURE 1>

H Standard English
M Andalusian Spanish
L immigrants' L1s

Figure 1: Triglossia in Gibraltar.

It must also be noted that before the introduction of the English language, the variety of Andalusian Spanish spoken in Gibraltar was subject to a dialect-standard dynamics in the sense of Auer (2005), with respect to Standard Spanish. This relationship was interrupted after the imposition of English as an exoglossic standard, when Spanish, being no longer exposed to the normative pressure of standard Castilian acquired the status of a *dachlose Mundart* (Kloss 1967), i.e. a non-codified substandard variety that is used in the absence of a normative reference point.

After the loss of the immigrants' heritage languages, which took place in different moments according to the communities, the new situation of English-Spanish bilingualism acquired the shape

of an *extended diglossia* (Fishman 1967). The two languages in the repertoire are thus characterised by the lack of a genealogic relationship, which is a key feature in Ferguson's (1959) definition, and by a clear-cut functional division between the L and the H variety. This distinction however weakened over time, allowing for a transition from what probably was a case of medial diglossia towards spoken diglossia and hence to an "attenuated form of diglossia" (or type-B repertoire in the terms of Auer 2005), with an increasing expansion of the functions covered by H; see Figure 2.

<PLEASE INSERT HERE FIGURE 2>




Figure 2: Diglossia in Gibraltar.

Relatively recent historical events have played a key role in determining a change from the situation described so far. First, the evacuation of most of the Gibraltarian population during WWII sent the Spanish-speaking inhabitants out of their homes, often to English-speaking countries such as England, Northern Ireland, Azores and Jamaica for a period of more than 5 years. Second, after the war the English education system was introduced in Gibraltar, whereby children began to receive formal teaching in English from the first years of school, while Spanish started being taught only as a foreign language. Finally, the most recent event, and also the one with probably the greatest effects on language practices, was the closure of the border with Spain ordered by Francisco Franco's regime. In the period from 1969 to 1985 the political hostility between Spain and Gibraltar reached its climax; indeed, by closing the border, Franco eliminated all direct connections between the two territories and Gibraltar found itself strongly dependent on the United Kingdom. Against the backdrop of these social and political tensions, the British element was enforced in the self-representation of the Gibraltarian community, while at the same time negative attitudes toward Spain started to develop, favouring a shift towards English at a community level. Spanish lost most of its domains of usage, and it was probably at this point that intergenerational transmission of this language was interrupted in most families (see Kellerman 2001). Conversely, English spread across all the informal domains, including interaction in the peer-group and within the family, where Spanish used to be firmly established.

This final step in the evolution of the repertoire can be considered as a case of *dilalia* (Berruto 1987, 1995) or *diaglossia* (Auer 2005), a situation in which English has broadly expanded its domains to include also the informal and familiar domains, including primary socialisation, that were formerly associated with L. Such a scenario is also prominently characterised by a sensible increase in the range of language contact phenomena, caused by the great functional overlap between the codes, both in terms of code-switching and of structural interference, intended as both matter and pattern borrowing (Matras & Sakel 2007).

<PLEASE INSERT HERE FIGURE 3>




Figure 3: *Dilalia in Gibraltar.*

As can be seen from the chart in Figure 3, in this particular situation a new register of English has developed, which is referred to as Gibraltarian English (Kellermann 2001). This variety is the product of a nativisation of the former exoglossic standard, a process that has only recently been completed. In the perspective of Kellerman (1996, 2001) Gibraltarian English is comparable to other World Englishes (see Mesthrie and Bhatt 2008) that have developed in several English-speaking post-colonial settings. So far, the structural description of this variety has thus been limited to its phonetic inventory (Levey 2008) and to prosodic features (Kellermann 2001).

In conclusion, the evolution of the linguistic repertoire has led to a situation that is extremely favourable for the transition from code-switching to an emergent fused lect. Code-switching in all its forms has in fact become a widespread phenomenon that enjoys positive evaluations by most of the population, to such a point that the local folk name *llanito*, while extremely polysemous, may also refer to the frequent alternation between the two languages as globally opposed to monolingual practices (see Moyer 1998, 2000).

2. Data

The corpus used for this research consists of about 20 hours of taped recordings collected during two fieldwork periods in 2013ⁱⁱⁱ. In the first session, participants were asked to perform different tasks, such as translating sentences, doing a role-play activity and participating in semi-structured interviews concerning local identity, history and culture, as well as topics related to the current social and political situation. Since the latter of these activities gave the best results for an analysis of bilingual speech, during the second session only semi-structured interviews were recorded. Even if the interviewees were not aware that bilingual speech was the object of analysis and did not receive any instructions concerning the language to be used in the interview, the amount of elements from both languages in almost every recording allows us to think that these data actually reflect the patterns of freely occurring speech. Conversely, recording ordinary conversation without being a member of the community would have posed a number of practical and methodological problems without necessarily improving the reliability of the data. For example, it would have prevented the researcher from relying also on participant observation, which played an important part, for example, in the interpretation of conversational code-switching (see example 8 further on).

From the whole corpus, I selected a balanced sample of approximately 6 hours, which was manually annotated through the ELAN software (Sloetjes and Wittenburg 2008). Three age classes

were identified in order to represent different stages in the evolution of a repertoire where language shift is taking place (Levey 2008 among others): elderly speakers, middle-age speakers and young speakers. Elderly speakers were over the age of 60 at the time of the interviews. Most of them received education before the British system was introduced, and acquired English during World War II, while being evacuated to the United Kingdom or other English-speaking countries. Speakers between the ages of 30 and 60 were labelled as middle-age speakers: all of them attended school after the education reform and experienced the period in which the border with Spain was closed. Finally, speakers younger than 30 years old have been raised in the present social and political situation, after the re-opening of the border. Even if their exposure to Spanish is, in principle, higher than in the previous generation, several young Gibraltarians have English as their L1 and only some of them declared to use Spanish in the household. As also observed by Weston (2013), only within this age-bracket we find native Gibraltarians who only know Spanish as a foreign language taught at school.

3. Fusion in Gibraltar

3.1. Alternation and utterance modifiers

Building on Auer (2014), fusion is chiefly intended here as the sedimentation of bilingual patterns, to such a point that all alternatives are gradually ruled out. I will focus here on one particular type of pattern, namely clause-peripheral alternation in Muysken's (2000) terms, while I will not consider cases of insertion or congruent lexicalization, that are also present in my corpus. Alternation is defined by Muysken as the juxtaposition of constituents from language A and language B, each structured according to the syntactic principles of the respective language. Consider examples^{iv} (1) – (3):

- (1) ENTONCE' MIRA E'CUCHA, EL PERRO, *are you gonna stay with it or what?*
 so look listen the dog
 'So, look, listen, the dog, are you going to stay with it or what?'
- (2) *and* MUCHO' DE LO' MILITARE' *had most of the big houses here*
 many of the military
 'and many soldiers had most of the big houses here'
- (3) *when we consciously try to speak llanito,* NO LO HABLAMO'
 NEG it speak:3PL
 'when we consciously try to speak llanito, we don't truly speak it'

As can be observed in these examples, alternation is an extremely variable phenomenon that may include constituents of different sizes and different internal complexity, ranging from single monomorphemic items to relatively long stretches of speech (see also Deuchar, Muysken & Wang 2007). Due to its relative unpredictability, alternation normally does not lead to the sedimentation of regular patterns; hence, there are very few instances of fused lects based on alternation (Auer 2014). However, I will focus here on a specific case of alternation, namely that of clause-peripheral elements of different sizes, typically conveying a pragmatic or procedural (Sperber & Wilson 1986,

Blakemore 2002) meaning. Matras (1998) identifies a functional class of *utterance modifiers*, including discourse markers, interjections, question tags, phasal adverbs and other elements that are not integrated into the grammatical frame of the utterance. He argues that all such elements share a similar behaviour in contact situations and in particular, because of their *detachability* from the propositional content of the utterance, they constitute a favoured point for code-mixing. Contrary to other types of alternation, according to Auer (2014), fusion in the system of utterance modifiers is observed in several contact situations, even if it represents a weaker form of fusion compared to the structures emerging out of intra-clausal patterns. Cases of fused lects involving utterance modifiers are well-known in the literature: in some cases, they involve a nearly total replacement of one set of items (see for example Salmons 1990 and Goss & Salmons 2000), in some others the bilingual patterns have only partially grammaticalised into a fused lect, leading to the formation of so-called mixed codes (Maschler 1998, Schaengold 2004).

I argue that such tendencies are already observable in Gibraltar's bilingual speech, where a major divide is found between elements of sentence grammar, which tend to be expressed in English, and elements of discourse grammar (in the sense of Kaltenböck *et al.* 2011), which tend to be expressed in Spanish. As will be argued in 3.1, in this case monolingual alternatives have not been fully ruled out, as in fully developed fused lects, but two diagnostic signs of ongoing fusion can nevertheless be observed: (loss of) pragmatic markedness and unidirectionality. The elements involved in this process belong to a formally heterogeneous class that is defined on a functional basis; they may be labelled as extra-clausal constituents, following Dik (1997), or utterance modifiers, following Matras (1998). Crucially, these items differ with regard to (i) their degree of integration into the clause and (ii) their internal complexity and degree of schematicity/lexical specificity (see Gorla, *in press*). My analysis focusses in particular on four types of such entities:

- i. Discourse markers
- ii. Left dislocations
- iii. Coordinating conjunctions
- iv. Subordinating conjunctions

I will use the term 'extra-clausal constituents' (ECCs) in order to refer to this set of items. While some elements, e.g. discourse markers, undisputedly belong to the class of ECCs as discussed in Dik (1997), both coordinating and subordinating conjunctions are usually not included in this classification. For the purposes of this study they were subsumed under this heading because, following a qualitative analysis of the data, their behaviour appeared extremely consistent with that displayed by other ECCs.

3.2. Analysis parameters

There are two features that enable us to consider bilingual speech in Gibraltar as an incipient stage of fusion. They are: (a) the tendential loss of pragmatic markedness (b) unidirectionality (see further Figure 5).

One of the main features that distinguishes conversational code-switching from code-mixing is the different pragmatic value of these two phenomena. Code-switching represents one of the strategies for contextualising (see Gumperz 1982, Auer 1984, Auer & Di Luzio 1992) specific aspects of the utterance, while code-mixing is devoid of any pragmatic or interactional function. Consider (4):

(4)

01 *I know people* QUE *have a master's or a degree in history*
REL

02 *or whatever and they're working here in a bank*

03 PORQUE NO QUIEREN VIVÍ A FUERA NO
because NEG want live to outside no

'I know people who have a master's or a degree in History or whatever, and they're working here in a bank, because they do not want to live outside, no?'

In (4), two different patterns coexist. The passage from English to Spanish at line 3 serves a conversational function, in that the switch into Spanish contextualizes the second utterance as a justification for the statement made before. At the same time, at line 1 the speaker uses a Spanish complementiser to introduce an entirely English clause. Switches of this type are frequently found in the corpus and totally lack any discourse- or participant-oriented motivation: for this reason, we may hypothesise that they represent sedimented patterns that, along with other features, define the emerging fused lect.

With the term unidirectionality, I refer to the fact that while code-switching is possible in both directions, when code-mixing undergoes sedimentation, one particular type of pattern becomes increasingly frequent and tends to prevail over other competing forms. Thus, in the case of Gibraltar, both English and Spanish may be selected as the language of interaction, and speakers resort to code-switching in both directions based on the local requirements of the conversation. However, clause-peripheral alternation is much more constrained: while patterns involving a Spanish peripheral element and an English clause are found with an extreme frequency, there are only a few occurrences of the opposite. In my view, even if these bilingual patterns have not yet been fully conventionalised, and monolingual alternatives still represent a possibility, the emergence of such arbitrary constraints can indeed be seen as a sign of incipient fusion.

In order to take into account both these parameters, in Goría (2018) I propose to identify three types of alternational pattern involving clauses and ECCs, which will provide a basis for quantitative analysis: each type is characterised by a different position of the switch, which may or may not be related to particular pragmatic values, and is associated to a language value corresponding to the language in which the ECC occurs, which should account for the direction of the switch.

The first pattern is labelled as "type 1" and corresponds to cases in which a switch occurs between a clause and the following ECC, as in example (5):

(5)

01 *he went through an adventure with some dwarf friends*

02 Y SE ENCONTRÓ UN ANILLO

and REFL found a ring

03 QUE ÉL NO SABÍA QUE LO HACÍA DE DESAPARECÉ

REL he NEG knew that him made of disappear

04 *it made him invisible*

05 Y SE LO QUITÓ A UN HOBBIT

and 3SG.OBL it took_away to a Hobbit

06 QUE SE LLAMABA GOLLUM
REL REFL called Gollum

‘He went through an adventure with some dwarf friends and he found a ring, that he didn’t know it caused him to disappear; it made him invisible. And he took it away from a hobbit whose name was Gollum’

In (5), at lines 2 and 5 the conjunction occurs in the same language as the subsequent clause, to which it is also attached prosodically, and in a different language from the preceding clause. This pattern represents an instance of code-switching in that here alternation between English and Spanish fulfils a discursive function. In (5) the speaker is telling the plot of a book; at line 2, his transition to Spanish can be seen as an attempt to draw attention on a crucial point in the plot, while at line 5 the speaker restores Spanish after the repair occurring at line 4.

The second case is labelled as “type 2” and corresponds to cases in which the ECC occurs in the same language as the preceding clause, but in a different language from the subsequent one, the latter often representing its anchor clause (Huddleston & Pullum 2002), i. e. the clause to which it is attached; consider (6):

(6)

01 PRIMERO *hats off to him because we need someone from that generation*
first

02 *for* D É MA’ CHICO QUE YO
for D is more young than me

‘first of all, hats off to him, because we need someone from that generation, for D is younger than me’

In (6), switching from English to Spanish still seems to be related to the typical functions of conversational code-switching, in that the second unit occurring at line 2 is subsidiary to the previous clause in that it provides a reason for the statement made before. However, unlike (5), the connective *for*, which belongs to an entirely Spanish turn, occurs in a different language than the rest of the utterance. Therefore, while in type 1 the language of the ECC is the same of the upcoming clause, in type 2 there is still an inter-sentential switch, but the ECC occurs in a different language with respect to the following clause.

Finally, in “type 3” patterns the ECC occurs in a language different from both the preceding and subsequent clauses. Consider the first line of example (4), repeated here as (7):

(7) *i know people* QUE *have a master’s or a degree in history*
REL

‘I know people who have a master’s or a degree in history’

Patterns like (7) lack any of the pragmatic functions typically associated with code-switching and represent instances of alternational code-mixing. In a fusion scenario, these may be considered as what remains of types 1 and 2 after Spanish has been progressively replaced by English.

To sum up, if the context in which clause-peripheral alternation takes place is taken into account, it is possible to distinguish between patterns reflecting a stage of code-switching, i. e. type 1 and (less straightforwardly) type 2, and patterns of code-mixing, i. e. type 3.

3.3.Results

Now that the three patterns relevant to this study have been defined, we can analyse their frequency distributions in the corpus, along with monolingual patterns, indicated as “type 0”; consider Figure 4.

<PLEASE INSERT FIGURE 4 HERE>

	TYPE 0		TYPE 1		TYPE 2		TYPE 3	
	Eng	Spa	Eng	Spa	Eng	Spa	Eng	Spa
Discourse markers	173	94	31	51	16	34	7	130
left dislocations	16	5	1	1	0	2	0	5
conjunctions	440	189	66	91	16	47	7	84
complementisers	242	111	62	43	11	30	3	36
Total	871	399	160	186	43	113	17	255

Figure 4: Frequency distributions of bilingual patterns involving different types of ECCs. The labels “Eng” and “Spa” refer to the language in which the ECC element is expressed.

English appears to be quantitatively prevalent over Spanish in monolingual patterns, in that English type 0 patterns are more than twice as frequent as their Spanish counterparts. With regard to bilingual patterns, moving from type 1 to type 3, in all the four classes of ECCs, an increase in unidirectionality is clearly noticeable. In type 1 patterns, corresponding to inter-sentential switching, English and Spanish have a similar number of tokens, as conversational code-switching by definition may occur in both directions. The situation is partially different in type 2, where Spanish ECCs occur between two and three times more frequently than their English counterparts. Finally, type 3 patterns almost categorically involve Spanish ECCs, which are ten times more frequent than their English counterparts. Such a distribution demonstrates that the different types of bilingual patterns may actually reflect different stages in the emergence of a fused lect. While no specific trend is found in those types associated with code-switching, type 3 patterns show signs of sedimentation, in that one set of forms appears to be quantitatively prevailing over the other.

4. Fusion in apparent time

An important part in Auer’s (2014) account of fusion is the idea that the development of fused lects is often dependent on global sociolinguistic changes. Language shift occurring at community level may lead to a process of matrix language turnover (Myers-Scotton 1993), which is the main factor triggering fusion in bilingual speech. Typically, the in-group community language functions as the matrix language in bilingual speech. However, when the in-group language is replaced by some other variety in a process of language shift, it is expected that this variety will represent the new matrix language in code-mixing.

In this respect, Gibraltar follows suit. Previous studies have provided evidence for the ongoing nativisation of the English language (Levey 2008) and of the expansion of its domains within the

younger generations in a language shift framework; therefore, a matrix language turnover is extremely likely. Weston (2013) provides empirical data in favour of this view: when he observes different patterns of behaviour in four age classes, showing that differences between age classes are reflected in differences in language choice, as well as in the preference for different code-switching/mixing patterns. Even if Weston does not explicitly discuss a language shift scenario, his data clearly suggest that Spanish is associated with the older generations, while the younger generations are characterised by greater variability, with several inter-speaker differences, but with an increase in the use of English in all contexts.

Building on these observations, as well as on the synchronic analysis of bilingual patterns presented in section 3, I propose to analyse the data on an apparent time perspective (Sankoff 2006), in order to identify a correlation between age groups and types of bilingual behaviour. For this purpose, three age groups have been identified within the Gibraltar community, whose macro-sociolinguistic features are discussed in section 2. Each group is considered as representative of a particular stage in the process of language shift. Accordingly, changes in the form and in the socio-pragmatic values of bilingual speech will be analysed as different steps along the *code-switching* > *code-mixing* > *fused lect* continuum discussed by Auer (1999).

4.1. A comparison of three generations

The most relevant features of the three age groups considered for this study have been presented in Section 2. Here, I provide an exemplification of the most prominent features of bilingual speech observed in each generation, as an introduction to the quantitative evaluation discussed in 4.2.

4.1.1. Generation 1: elderly speakers

For elderly speakers, Spanish and English still maintain different functional values, and code-switching typically functions as a contextualisation cue with a discourse-related or participant-related value (Auer 1984); consider (8):

(8)

- 01 CB3 *my mother's grandmother <...> // she was (.) her name was Catalina G.*
 02 *her brother was barba balun we used to call him // Domingo G.*
 03 Y EL PADRE DE VICENTE // PAPÁ DE VICENTE
 and the father of Vicente dad of Vicente
 ‘and Vicente’s father, Vicente’s dad’
 04 CB4 VICENTE SI
 Vicente yes
 05 CB3 *was G. as well // brother as well*
 06 CB4 SI SI

language practices of these three generations go along with the process of language shift, in that there is a transition from a Spanish-dominant generation to an English-dominant one.

It is now possible to present a quantitative evaluation of the tendencies described so far. In this part of the study I shall restrict the focus of my investigation to patterns involving conjunctions and complementisers. The main reason for this choice is that these items, as opposed to discourse markers, have a greater degree of integration into the grammatical frame of the clause and are obligatory; therefore, according to implicational hierarchies such as Stolz & Stolz (1996) and Matras (1998), a switching of such elements implies a switching of other only loosely attached elements. Moreover, while discourse markers form an open class, conjunctions and complementisers represent a finite set with clearer formal and functional correspondences between English and Spanish. I consider coordinating conjunctions to be those forms that in both languages are used to express the three basic coordination relations identified in Mauri (2008), i.e. *combination* (English *and*, Spanish *y*), *alternative* (English *or*, Spanish *o*) and *contrast* (English *but*, Spanish *pero*). To identify subordinating conjunctions, I follow the basic distinction between complement clauses, relative clauses and adverbial clauses (see Gast & Diessel 2012 for a more detailed account of clause-linkage). The distribution of bilingual patterns is presented in Figure 5:

<PLEASE INSERT HERE FIGURE 5>

	TYPE 0		TYPE 1		TYPE 2		TYPE 3		Total
	Eng	Spa	Eng	Spa	Eng	Spa	Eng	Spa	
YOUNG	199	57	31	44	8	21	3	58	421
conj	115	36	17	24	7	17	1	38	255
comp	84	21	14	20	1	4	2	20	166
MIDDLE	349	149	66	106	22	67	5	95	859
conj	242	90	38	60	10	37	2	70	549
comp	107	59	28	46	12	30	3	25	310
OLD	175	145	27	35	5	13	3	13	416
conj	97	83	12	23	4	6	3	8	236
comp	78	62	15	12	1	7	0	5	180

Figure 5: the distribution of bilingual patterns involving complementisers and conjunctions in each generation.

Figure 5 shows the distribution of each of the patterns under scrutiny in the three age groups considered for this study. In order to detect the significance of inter-group differences, two separate one-way ANOVA tests were conducted, considering the distribution of English and Spanish ECCs in the three possible bilingual patterns. Type 0, i. e. monolingual patterns, were not considered in the test. The results show that no significant difference is found in the distribution of the English patterns. Conversely, a significant correlation was found between age and the distribution of patterns with Spanish conjunctions and complementisers, with $p < 0,01$ ($p=0,007$). The data related to Spanish patterns are summarised in Figure 6.

%	TYPE 0	TYPE 1	TYPE 2	TYPE 3
YOUNG	32	24	12	32
MIDDLE	36	25	16	23
OLD	70	17	6	6

Figure 6: Percentage of Spanish patterns in the three age classes.

The distribution of Spanish in the corpus is compatible with a language shift scenario: in the older generation, Spanish occurs in the 70% of cases in monolingual interactions, while instances of type 3 patterns, are limited to the 6%. This picture is radically different in the middle generation, where monolingual Spanish represents around one third of all the occurrences; conversely, there is an increase in the use of all three bilingual patterns considered; we can thus consider this stage as a mixed code. Finally, younger speakers appear to use monolingual Spanish slightly less than in the previous case, while there is a considerable increase in type 3 patterns. Therefore, the apparent-time perspective adopted here supports the hypothesis that fusion is starting to take place in the speech of middle and primarily young generations. Since language shift towards English, which is responsible for a matrix-language turnover in bilingual speech, seems to be the main cause for the onset of fusion in this scenery; however, further verifications are still required, involving more refined statistical tools.

5. Discussion and conclusions

The aim of this paper was to provide an interpretation of alternational code-mixing in Gibraltar in terms of a transition from code-switching to the initial stage of a fused lect. In order to evaluate this hypothesis, three types of pattern were identified, each associated to the presence or absence of pragmatic functions and to a different position and size of the switch. Their distribution was then analysed in relation with three age-groups identified on an apparent-time perspective and generation-specific trends were observed.

These findings pave the way for some generalisations about the earlier stages of fusion. It is particularly important to stress the mutual correspondence between social and linguistic factors: societal changes at community level produce effects on the linguistic repertoires, which in turn may change the socio-pragmatic values associated with bilingual speech. In Gibraltar, these conditions favour the emergence and gradual sedimentation of structural regularities in code-mixing: the code-switching patterns observed in the older generation can be considered typical of spoken diglossia (Auer 2005), while in middle-generation and young speakers, who mark the transition to a dilalic, or type-C, repertoire (see Section 1), alternational code-mixing has become not only more frequent, but also more coherent in its structure.

The most obvious link between code-mixing in Gibraltar and Auer's (1999, 2014) fused lects is the gradual transition from bilingual speech proper to what can be regarded as a substantially monolingual mode characterised by the choice of English as the base language of the interaction, with minimal contributions from Spanish, typically occurring at the periphery of the clause. The most striking similarity of this situation with other fused lects, and perhaps also with some mixed languages, lies, in my view, in the social meaning associated to the emerging fused lect. Several recent works on fused lects (O'Shannessy 2012 among others) have shown that such varieties often emerge as new registers associated to particular social groups within multilingual societies and Gibraltar fits very well in this picture: regular alternation patterns surface out as a feature of younger speakers and, as also argued by Levey (2008) about innovative phonetic features of Gibraltar English, the survival and future development of these features is still partly unpredictable and should be verified in further investigations.

6. References

- Auer, P. (Ed.). (1998). *Code-switching in Conversation: Language, interaction and identity*. London: Routledge.
- Auer, P. (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.
- Auer, P. (2005). Europe's Sociolinguistic unity, or: A typology of European dialect/standard constellations.
- Auer, P. (2014). Language mixing and language fusion: when bilingual talk becomes monolingual. In J. Besters-Dilger, C. Dermarkar, S. Pfänder, & A. Rabus (Eds.), *Congruence in Contact-Induced Language Change*. Berlin, Boston: DE GRUYTER. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110338454.294>
- Auer, P., & DiLuzio, A. (Eds.). (n.d.). *The contextualization of Language*.
- Auer, Peter. (1984). *Bilingual conversation*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Berruto, G. (1987). Lingua, dialetto, diglossia, dilalia. In *Romania et Slavia adriatica: Festschrift für Žarko Muljačić* (pp. 57–81). Hamburg: Buske.
- Berruto, G. (n.d.). *Fondamenti di Sociolinguistica*. Bari: Laterza.
- Blakemore, D. (n.d.). *Relevance and linguistic meaning: the semantics and pragmatics of discourse markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cavilla, M. (n.d.). *Diccionario Yanito*. Gibraltar: Med Sun.
- Dal Negro, S., & Iannaccaro, G. (2003). Qui parliamo tutti uguale ma è diverso. Repertori complessi e interventi sulle lingue. In A. Valentini, P. Molinelli, & P. Cuzzolin (Eds.), *Atti del XXVI congresso internazionale di studi della Società di Linguistica Italiana (Bergamo, 26-28 settembre 2002)* (pp. 431–450). Roma: Bulzoni.

- Denison, N. (1979). Zur Triglossie in der Zahre. In P. Ureland (Ed.), *Standardsprache und Dialekte in mehrsprachige Gebieten Europas* (pp. 27–37). Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Deuchar, M., Muysken, P., & Wang, S. L. (2007). Structured variation in code-switching: towards an empirically based typology of bilingual speech patterns. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 10, 298–340.
- Dik, S. (1997). *The Theory of Functional Grammar. Part II, Complex and derived constructions*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Ferguson, C. (n.d.). Diglossia. *Word*, 16, 325–340.
- Fishman, J. (1967). Bilingualism with and without diglossia; diglossia with and without bilingualism. *Journal of Social Issues*, 23(2), 29–38.
- Gast, V., & Diessel, H. (Eds.). (2012). *Clause linkage in cross-linguistic perspective: data-driven approaches to cross-clausal syntax*. Berlin ; Boston: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Goria, E. (2016). The role of extra-clausal constituents in bilingual speech: The emerging of regular patterns in a bilingual corpus. In G. Kaltenböck, E. Keizer, & A. Lohmann (Eds.), *Outside the clause* (Vol. 178, pp. 273–302). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
<https://doi.org/10.1075/slcs.178.10gor>
- Goria, E. (2018). *Inglese e spagnolo a Gibilterra. Le dinamiche del discorso bilingue*. Bologna: Caissa.
- Goria, E. (n.d.). Complex items and units in extra-sentential code-switching: Spanish and English in Gibraltar. *Usage-Based Contact Linguistics: Effects of Frequency and Similarity in Language Contact*.
- Goss, E. L., & Salmons, J. C. (2000). The evolution of a Bilingual Discourse Marking System: Modal particles and English markers in German-American dialects. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 4(4), 469–484. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13670069000040040501>

- Gumperz, J. J. (1964). Hindi-Punjabi code-switching in Delhi. In H. Hunt (Ed.), *Proceedings of the ninth international congress of linguistics* (pp. 1115–1124). The Hague: Mouton.
- Huddleston, R., & Pullum, G. (2002). *The Cambridge grammar of the English language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kaltenböck, G., Heine, B., & Kuteva, T. (2011). On thetical grammar. *Studies in Language*, 35, 852–897.
- Kellermann, A. (1996). ‘When Gibraltarians speak we’re quite unique!’ Constructing Gibraltarian identity with the help of English, Spanish and their respective local varieties. In S. M. De Olivera (Ed.) (pp. 73–78). Presented at the The linguistic construction of social and personal identity. First international conference of sociolinguistics in Portugal, Evora: Cidehus.
- Kellermann, A. (2001). *A new new English. Language, politics and identity in Gibraltar*. Heidelberg: Heidelberg Schriften zur Sprache und Kultur.
- Kloss, H. (1967). Abstand languages and Ausbau languages. *Anthropological Linguistics*, 9(7), 29–41.
- Kramer, J. (1986). *English and Spanish in Gibraltar*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Levey, D. (2008). *Language change and variation in Gibraltar*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Maschler, Y. (1998). On the transition from code-switching to a mixed code. In P. Auer (Ed.), *Code switching in conversation. Language, interaction, identity* (pp. 125–149). London: Routledge.
- Matras, Y. (1998). Utterance modifiers and universals of grammatical borrowing. *Linguistics*, 36(2), 281–331.
- Matras, Y. (2002). Fusion and the cognitive base for bilingual discourse markers. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 4(4), 505–528.
- Mauri, C. (2008). *Coordination Relations in the Languages of Europe and Beyond*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110211498>

- Meakins, F. (2012). Which mix - code-switching or a mixed language? - Gurindji Kriol. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages*, 27(1), 105–140.
- Mesthrie, R., & Bhatt, R. (n.d.). *World Englishes. The study of new linguistic varieties*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Moyer, M. G. (1998). Bilingual conversation strategies in Gibraltar. In P. Auer (Ed.), *Code-switching in conversation. Language, interaction, identity*. London: Routledge.
- Moyer, M. G. (2002). Negotiating agreement and disagreement in Spanish-English bilingual conversations with 'no'. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 4(4), 458–505.
- Muysken, P. (n.d.). *Bilingual speech*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1993). *Duelling languages. Grammatical structure in codeswitching*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- O'Shannessy, C. (2004). Light Warlpiri: a new language. *Australian Journal of Linguistics*, 25(1), 31–57.
- O'Shannessy, C. (2012). The role of code-switched input to children in the origin of a new mixed language. *Linguistics*, 50(2), 305–340.
- Poplack, S. (1980). Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish y termino en Español. *Linguistics*, 18, 581–618.
- Salmons, J. C. (1990). Bilingual discourse marking. Codeswitching, borrowing and convergence in some German-American dialects. *Linguistics*, 28, 453–480.
- Sankoff, G. (2006). Age: apparent time and real time. In K. Brown (Ed.), *The encyclopaedia of language and linguistics* (pp. 110–116). Oxford: Elsevier.
- Schaengold, C. C. (2004). *Bilingual Navajo: mixed codes, bilingualism and language maintenance* (PhD dissertation). Ohio State University.

- Toso, F. (2000). L'onomastica di origine ligure a Gibilterra. *Estudis Romànics*, 22, 83–100.
- Toso, F. (2004). Obsolescenza linguistica e sopravvivenze lessicali: la Caleta a Gibilterra. In V. Orioles & F. Toso (Eds.), *Atti del convegno di studi 'Mediterraneo plurilingue', Genova, 13-15 maggio 2004* (pp. 299–321).
- Weston, D. A. (2013). Code-switching variation in Gibraltar. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 17(1), 3–22. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1367006911429526>

ⁱ Weaker forms of fusion, such as the case discussed here, are much more common than fully fledged mixed languages and have not remained unnoticed in the literature on bilingual speech; terms that were previously used to depict a situation similar to the present case study are for example: “code-switching as the unmarked choice” (Myers-Scotton 1993 and onwards), “code-switching mode” (Poplack 1980), “code-switching style” (Gumperz 1964) and “mixed code” (Maschler 1998, Schaengold 2004, Muysken 2007).

ⁱⁱ A similar situation was observed by Denison (1979) in the trilingual community of Sauris, Italy. In this context, while Italian is firmly established as the H code, the two minority languages, Friulian and the local German dialect, have a different status. The former, in fact, has a broader areal diffusion compared to the latter and is also present in the neighbouring communities; therefore, it occupies an intermediate position in the repertoire.

ⁱⁱⁱ The fieldwork research was carried out as part of a doctoral research project at Pavia University; see Gorla (2018).

^{iv} The examples are presented in orthographic transcription for what concerns English, and in an adapted orthographic transcription for what concerns Spanish. This is due to the fact that Gibraltar Spanish appears to be saliently characterized by an innovative Andalusian feature, namely the phenomenon of syllable coda deletion (Villena 2008). In order to represent this phenomenon, the syllables resulting from this process are indicated with an <'> sign if they are unstressed (as in *entonce'* “then”; Standard *entonces*), and with an accent if they are stressed (as in *viví*, “to live”; Standard *vivir*)