Linguistics

MORPHOLOGICAL AND SYNTACTICAL ASPECTS OF ROMANIAN/ ENGLISH CODESWITCHING

Arina GREAVU
"Lucian Blaga" University of Sibiu

e-mail: arina.greavu@ulbsibiu.ro

Abstract: *This paper examines the grammatical structure of Romanian/ English codeswitching in the speech of a ten-year-old bilingual child. The analyzed data set consists of single-word switches and phrases, the main focus of the paper being the morphological integration of these English elements in Romanian and the relations they establish with their larger syntactic environment. Using the principles of the Matrix Language Frame model developed by Myers-Scotton (2002, 2006), we show that the structural integrity of Romanian is maintained during codeswitching, and that the English material is used according to the rules imposed by the Romanian grammar. Although Romanian inflectional morphology is often absent on switched words and phrases, the placement of these elements in the grammatical frame of the sentence follows matrix language specifications and word order; moreover, function words in mixed constituents, such as determiners and prepositions, tend to come from Romanian.*
Keywords: bilingualism; codeswitching; morphological integration; word order.

1. Introduction

The spread of English as the lingua franca of our times and the growing access of Romanians to various fields of the English-speaking world after 1989 have led to an unprecedented penetration of this language in many spheres of everyday life in Romania, both in writing and in speech (Zafiu, 2001). While the influence of English over Romanian is well documented with respect to the adoption of loans in the written press and in dictionaries (Pârlog, 2004, Șimon et al. 2021), comparatively little work has been done on the way in which the two languages come together in the speech of bilinguals. Romanian/ English codeswitching has been studied by researchers analyzing the speech of Romanian immigrants in English-speaking countries (Beligan, 1999, Ene, 2001, Bancu, 2013, 2014, Petrescu, 2014), but there are no studies, to my knowledge, on the codeswitching patterns of Romanian/ English bilinguals born and living in Romania–a different type of speaker,

belonging to a different speech community and under a different pattern of exposure to English.

This paper is an attempt to describe the grammatical structure of codeswitching encountered in the speech a ten-year old bilingual child, who speaks Romanian as her first language and English as a second language. The main questions we ask are: (1) what types of English elements are used in the child's speech? (2) what are the specific points in the clause where these elements occur? (3) how are these elements integrated into the morphosyntactic structure of Romanian? Thus, the data will be analyzed both quantitatively, with respect to the proportions held by different categories in the total of switches, and qualitatively, with respect to their assimilation to Romanian.

The analysis will show that English switches in our data always follow Romanian syntactic rules, but they are often used without the necessary morphological endings of the matrix language, either retaining source-language morphemes (for example the plural and the past participle morphemes) or occurring as bare forms, without any morphological marking at all. For example, in the sentence below the noun *lessons* retains the English plural morpheme, and the verb *count* lacks the necessary marking for tense, person and number required by Romanian grammar:

1.	două	*lessons*	compensează		cu		
	two	lessons	compensate		with		
	normal streak	ca să	se	*count*	că	ai	făcut.
	normal streak	to	Refl.	count	that	have	done

'Two lessons compensate for a normal streak, to count that you have done them.'[86]

2. Theoretical framework

Codeswitching is "the alternate use of two languages including everything from the introduction of a single, unassimilated word up to a complete sentence or more into the context of another language" (Haugen, 1973: 521). This definition given to codeswitching by Einar Haugen almost fifty years ago is still considered valid today, the general consensus among researchers being that switching between languages can take place at any level and includes a full range of structures from bound morphemes, to words, phrases and entire sentences (Boumans, 1998, Muysken, 2000, Myers-Scotton, 2006). Consequently, the literature broadly distinguishes between *intersentential switching*, or switching between clauses or sentences,

[86] In this paper, italics will be used to highlight a switched element.

and *intrasentential codeswitching*, or switching within the same sentence. Examples of these categories from our Romania/ English data set are given below:

2. Ea mi-o dat trei pe gratis. *It's not like I asked or anything.* [87]
She gave me three for free. It's not like I asked or anything.

3. Și o început să lăcrimeze *and that is really not like him.*
And he started weeping and that is really not like him.

4.

Collar-ul	îl	perforez	și	pun	niște
Collar-Def.MSg	it	pierce	and	put	some

threads	prin	el.
threads	through	it

'The collar, I pierce it and I put some threads through it.'

Examples (2) and (3) illustrate intersentential switching, while (4) is an example of intrasentential switching: there are two clauses in the same sentence, each including elements from both English and Romanian, and one of these elements (*collar*-ul) involves a switch between a lexical stem and a bound morpheme.

Different models have been developed in an attempt to explain the grammar of codeswitching (for example Pfaff, 1979, Poplack, 1980, Woolford, 1983, Di Sciullo, Muysken & Singh, 1986, Muysken, 2000). The structures in my data set will be discussed from perspective of the *Matrix Language Frame* (*MLF*) model, developed by Carol Myers-Scotton in a series of publications starting with 1993. The general premise of this model is that in codeswitching situations there is always one dominant language, the *Matrix Language (ML)*, which sets the grammatical frame of the bilingual clause, and an *Embedded Language (EL)*, which supplies some of the content words, such as nouns, verbs, and adjectives. This asymmetry between the structural role of the ML and the EL is detailed in two specific principles of the model: the *Morpheme Order Principle*, which states that the matrix language dictates word order in mixed constituents, and the *System Morpheme Principle*, which states that the ML is the source of inflections and some function words in codeswitched clauses (Myers-Scotton, 2006: 244). Myers-Scotton also proposes a more general *Uniform Structure*

[87] To save space, in this paper we give a morpheme-by-morpheme gloss only for intrasentential switches.

Principle, according to which "in bilingual speech, the structures of the Matrix Language are always preferred, but some Embedded structures are allowed if Matrix Language clause structure is observed" (2006: 243). These general principles will serve as a background for the analysis conducted in this paper, as our main concern is to describe and explain the codeswitching patterns in the data set, rather than test the MLF model.

There are several reasons why I believe that the MLF model can be used to account for my data. First, this model was developed to explain codeswitching within the clause (241), which is the main focus of the present study. Second, the MLF model is intended to explain classic codeswitching, or codeswitching in which the speaker is proficient enough in the matrix language to follow its "well-formedness constraints" in "providing the morphosyntactic frame of a bilingual clause" (242). Since the child studied here is a native speaker of Romanian–the matrix language of bilingual clauses in our data–it is reasonable to assume that this is true of her. Moreover, she is fluent in both languages participating in codeswitching and the general contact circumstances are not changing, a situation which points towards a case of stable bilingualism, an important characteristic of classic codeswitching (Myers-Scotton, 2002: 111). Finally, the MLF model has been shown to make the correct predictions for child codeswitching before. For example, Paradis et al. (2000, cited in Myers-Scotton 2006: 333-334) show that even in the codeswitching of young children there is one language, the Matrix Language, which dominates the grammar of bilingual constituents.

2.1 Previous research on Romanian/ English codeswitching

Previous work on Romanian/ English codeswitching focuses on the speech of Romanian immigrants in English-speaking countries. For example, Ene (2001) checks the validity of several syntactic constraints proposed in the literature against Romanian/ English codeswitching in the United States, and concludes that they do not make the correct predictions for her data. Bancu (2013) compares the codeswitching patterns of first-generation Romanian-Americans with those of Romanian-Spanish bilinguals, and finds a lower degree of morphological assimilation to Romanian in the case of English than of Spanish elements. Petrescu (2014) analyses the codeswitching frequency of Romanian/ English bilingual children in Canada in the context of the acquisition and retention of Romanian by these children. She finds that switching takes place predominantly from Romanian to English and mainly serves to fill lexical gaps or answer some word-finding difficulty.

3. Methodology of research

3.1 The subject

The subject of this study is my daughter, S, a Romanian/ English bilingual child, who was born and lives in Romania. S started learning English as a second language before the age of four through cartoon watching and conversations with her parents, native Romanians with an active command of English. The child was not raised using the "one language, one parent" model, and, in general, was less exposed to English than to Romanian, as both parents mostly addressed her in Romanian and they always spoke Romanian to each other. At this stage, S's English was characterized by extensive codeswitching of single words from her first language, mainly in order to fill lexical gaps. Consider this example, recorded when S was 4;6 years old:

5. I put her here, because this is a train and Belle is the *șofer*.
I put her here, because this is a train and Belle is the driver.

Starting with the age of six, learning continued through reading in English, authors that S has read including Roald Dahl, J. K. Rowling, Rick Riordan, Jeff Kinney, C. S. Lewis, and Phillip Pullman. She attends a Romanian-speaking school where she has studied English as a foreign language for four years and, although we have conversations in English on a daily basis, we mostly speak Romanian at home. At the time when the study was conducted, S was ten to eleven years of age and her English was well-developed. At this stage, she codeswitches frequently and freely between her two languages, but codeswitching occurs now predominantly from a Romanian base and, in addition to single words, it also involves phrases, clauses, and entire sentences (see examples 6 and 8 below).

3.2 The data

I audio recorded the data between September and November 2021 in natural, spontaneous situations, during activities such as playing or eating, or when S was simply in conversation with her parents (mostly myself) on the subject of school, books, and hobbies. During these conversations I spoke mostly Romanian because I wanted to encourage the child to use Romanian herself as much as possible, since intrasentential codeswitching almost always occurs now from a Romanian base. However, even when I spoke Romanian the child responded either in Romanian or in English. The resulting recordings are of variable length, lasting from 10 minutes to 1 hour and totaling more than 20 hours of spontaneous speech. Only the utterances that contained codeswitching were transcribed, in total 931 utterances.

A much smaller amount of data came from journal entries consisting of nineteen codeswitching utterances that I wrote down during the same period of time (September-November 2021).

The resulting data set contains a variety of English elements, ranging from single words and phrases switched from a Romanian base, to clauses and entire sentences. Sometimes, both intrasentential and intersentential switches occur simultaneously, as in the example below containing a noun (*letter*), a verb (*expelled*), a prepositional phrase (*due to use of magic in a muggle populated area and in the presence of a muggle)*, and a sentence *(And that was all the proof they needed)*:

6.	Chiar	atunci	o	bufniță	o	venit	cu	*letter*-ul
	Right	then	an	owl	has	come	with	letter-Def.MSg

	că	o	fost	*expelled*	de la	Hogwarts
	that	has	been	expelled	from	Hogwarts

due to use of magic in a muggle populated area and in the presence of a muggle. And that was all the proof they needed.

'And right then an owl came with the letter that he had been expelled from Hogwarts due to the use of magic …'

Two English elements are counted as separate switches if they are not part of the same constituent. This approach follows Myers-Scotton's proposal that, although some adjacent elements may be a unit "in the speaker's intentions," they should be analyzed separately if they do not represent a linguistic unit (2002: 143). Consider the following example:

7.	E	*hole*-ul	*very*	*dark.*
	Is	hole-Def.MSg	very	dark

'The hole is very dark.'

In this case, *hole*-ul is the subject of the bilingual clause while *very dark* is a predicate, but they are not syntactically connected to each other and are therefore analyzed separately.

A common mixing pattern in our data is that involving an intrasentential switch followed by one or several monolingual English sentences, for example:

8.	imaginează-ți	că	vrei	să extragi	din	piatra	o	bucată
	imagine Refl.	that	want	to extract	from	stone	a	piece

	de	sticlă	care	este	*as thin as a sheet of paper,*
	of	glass	which	is	as thin as a sheet of paper

and you don't wanna crack it in the slightest bit, and you have to take it intact off … I mean, wouldn't that be really, really hard? Well, he got the hang of it, și l-o pus să lucreze într-o galerie mică, mică, mică.

'Imagine that you want to extract from stone a piece of glass which is as thin as a sheet of paper, (…), and they had him work in a small, small, small gallery.'

The focus of this paper is constituted by intrasentential codeswitching within Romanian clauses, while switched sentences and clauses will not be further discussed. The analyzed data set includes 510 single lexical items, mostly nouns, but also adjectives, verbs, and adverbs, and 216 phrases. The table below gives a quantitative overview of the different types of English elements identified in the corpus:

Switch type		No.
Single switches	Nouns	270
	Adjectives	162
	Verbs	65
	Adverbs	13
Phrasal switches	Noun phrases	131
	Prepositional phrases	36
	Verb phrases	29
	Adjective phrases	20
Total		**726**

Table 1: Types of intrasentential switches

4. Discussion of findings

4.1 Nouns and noun phrases

My data contains 270 English nouns and 131 English NPs embedded in Romanian clauses. Single nouns are by far the largest class of switched elements, reaching more than 50 percent in their category, while English noun phrases form the dominant class of multi-word switches. These findings are in line with the results of other studies reporting the prevalence of nouns in codeswitching corpora, for example Poplack (1980) on Spanish/ English, Treffers-Daller (1994) on French/ Dutch, Bancu (2013, 2014) on Romanian/ English.

Although some of the switched nouns designate novel objects or concepts for which Romanian lacks an established equivalent (*cookie, cupcake, crispy, nugget*), many others are high-frequency, household words with common correspondents in Romanian. In general, the English words and their Romanian equivalents are produced with equal ease and fluidity, sometimes within the same sentence. Note the use of *cups* and *căniţe* 'little

cups' in the first example below, and of *costum* 'suit' and *suit* in the second one:

9.	și	oricum,	nu	aveam	destule	*cups,*	aveam	cinci
	and	anyway,	not	had	enough	cups,	had	five

invitate,	inclusiv	mine,	și	patru	cănițe.
guests,	including	me,	and	four	little cups.

'And anyway, I didn't have enough cups, I had five guests, including myself, and four little cups.'

10.	era	îmbrăcată	într-un	costum	de	magician,	așa	cu
	was	dressed	in a	suit	of	magician	so	with

checkers	negre	și	mov,	și	avea	și	un	joben
checkers	black	and	purple	and	had	also	a	top hat

la fel ca	*suit*-ul,	cu	*checkers*	negre	și mov.
like	suit-Def.MSg	with	checkers	black	and purple

'She was wearing a magician's suit, like this with … black and purple checkers, (…) and she also had a top hat like the suit, with black and purple checkers.'

4.1.1 Number

Both in Romanian and in English the plural of nouns is marked morphologically by means of specific inflections, and syntactically in the agreement between the noun and its determiners. Approximately 40 percent of the plural EL nouns and less than 10 percent of the plural EL noun phrases in my data are morphologically integrated into Romanian by having the morpheme *-uri* attached to the stem. Examples include:

11.	poți	să	accesezi	mai multe	*lesson*-uri	și
	can	to	access	more	lesson-FPl	and

mai multe	povești.
more	stories

'You can access more lessons and more stories.'

12.	două	meniuri	de	*hot*	*dog*	*stand*-uri …
	two	menus	of	hot	dog	stand-FPl

'two menus for hot dog stands …'

The Romanian plural inflection is less common with multi-word noun phrases, which show a preference for the English plural. Note the use of the *-s* suffix with the NP in the first sentence below, and of the Romanian plural suffix with the single noun in the second sentence:

13.	da-s	foarte	multe	*shades of brown, white, and black.*
	but are	very	many	shades of brown, white, and black.

Și	are	aripioarele	așa	cu	niște	*zigzag*-uri	negre.
And	has	the wings	so	with	some	zigzag-FPl	black

'But there are many shades of brown, white, and black. And it has little wings like this, with black zigzags.'

More than 50 percent of the switched nouns and about 90 percent of the switched NPs in our corpus retain the English plural suffix, for example:

14.	Ei	nu	erau	*witches*	sau	*wizards,*	îți dai seama.
	They	not	were	witches	or	wizards	you can imagine

'They were not witches and wizards, you can imagine.'

15.	dac-ar fi	*cabbage leaves,*	majoritatea	copiilor	ar fi …
	if would be	cabbage leaves	most	children	would be

'If these were cabbage leaves, most children would be …'

Most English plural nouns are countable, and some of them occur both in their singular and in their plural forms, sometimes in the same sentence, as in (16) below:

16.	le	puneau	într-un	*jar*,	în	*jars*	așa	mici,
	them	put	in a	jar	in	jars	so	small

și	le	puneau	în	*tomb.*
and	them	put	in	tomb

'They would put them in a jar, in small jars, like this, and put them in the tomb.'

The use of both Romanian and English plural suffixes with the same noun stems (*tulips/ tulip*-uri, *snakes/ snake*-uri, *lessons/ lesson*-uri, *toppers/*

topper-e) suggests the idea that the choice between ML and EL inflections does not follow from the phonological characteristics of the head, but rather from its syntactic and semantic properties: in Romanian, subject nouns are generally affixed with the enclitic definite article, which is fused to the plural ending. Since the switch between the *-s* ending and the Romanian article is phonologically difficult, English nouns that require definiteness according to Romanian grammar prefer Romanian plural endings. Consider the following example:

17.	O	să	fac	o	cutiuță	de	*pencil toppers*, (…),		deci
	will	to	make	a	box	of	pencil toppers		so
	pencil topper-e-le				vor	fi	deja	cu	sârmă.
	pencil topper-FPl-Def.FPl				will	be	already	with	wire

‘I will make a box of pencil toppers, (…) so the pencil toppers will already have wire on them.’

Here, *pencil-topper* retains the English plural ending when it is indefinite in meaning, but uses the Romanian plural when it occurs as a subject requiring the definite article. Similarly, in the sentence below the noun *bracelet* is definite and uses the Romanian plural morpheme, while both *loose bracelets* and *armlets* are indefinite and thus use the English suffix:

18.	îmi	voi	pune	și	*bracelet*-uri-le,	egiptenii	
	Refl.	will	put	also	bracelet-FPl-Def.FPl	the Egyptians	
	niciodată	nu	aveau	*loose bracelets,*	tot timpul	erau	*armlets.*
	never	not	had	loose bracelets	always	were	armlets

‘I will also put my bracelets on, the Egyptians never had loose bracelets, they were always armlets.’

However, the correlation between definiteness and Romanian plural marking is far from categorical in our data, as more than 70 percent of the plural nouns inflected with Romanian endings are actually indefinite in meaning. On the other hand, English plural nouns are rarely definite, and when this happens, they are either used as bare forms or accompanied by the English determiner, as in the following example:

19.	Și	chiar	atunci	au	apărut	*the dementors.*
	And	right	then	have	appeared	the dementors

‘And right then the dementors appeared.’

The presence of an English inflection in a clause dominated by Romanian grammar seems to violate the System Morpheme Principle of the MLF model, which states that in bilingual clauses the inflectional morphology should come from the matrix language. However, plural morphemes constitute a special class of inflections, which are allowed in mixed constituents because they have conceptual content and are very tightly connected to their noun heads (Myers-Scotton 2002: 92). Thus, producing such EL noun + plural affix combinations is seen as "requiring the least proficiency in the Embedded Language" (149), which could explain why English plural nouns are so common in our data and occur in many other codeswitching corpora (for example *books* and *notes* in Beligan 1999: 4, or *patterns* in Bancu 2014: 21).

4.1.2 Definiteness

The vast majority of switched nouns in our data become definite by attaching the Romanian enclitic article *-ul* to the English stem. In detail, there are 58 single English nouns affixed with the Romanian definite article and only two English article + noun combinations (see example 19 above). In other words, EL determiners are permitted in mixed noun phrases although they are not the preferred choice, a situation which is consistent with the general predictions of the MLF model proposed by Myers-Scotton (2006). Examples of noun-determiner switches include:

20.	sunt	lipite	pe …	deasupra	*stove*-ului.
	are	stuck	on …	above	stove- Def.MSg.Dat

'They are stuck on … above the stove.'

21.	uneori,	luam	prima	dată	*treasure chest*-ul.
	sometimes	took	the first	time	treasure chest-Def.MSg

'Sometimes, I would take the treasure chest first.'

The English definite determiner is more common with noun phrases than with single nouns in our corpus. For example:

22.	Bastian	și-o	adunat	*the remaining army*
	Bastian	Refl. has	gathered	the remaining army

și	s-o	luptat.
and	Refl. has	fought

'Bastian gathered his remaining army and fought.'

23.	Și	nici	la	*the staff table in the big hall*		nu	era.
	And	neither	at	the staff table in the big hall		not	was

'And he wasn't at the staff table in the big hall either.'

In general, the definite article is used in contexts where a Romanian monolingual clause would require it, for example with nouns placed before demonstratives and possessives:

24.	El	oricum	era	deștept,	doar	că	nu-i	prea
	He	anyway	was	smart	just	that	not Refl.	really

plăcea	*coating*-ul	lui.
liked	coating-Def.MSg	his

'He was smart, anyway, he just didn't like his coating very much.'

Conversely, in situations when a definite article would be used in English but not in Romanian, this is always absent on English nouns and NPs switched inside Romanian clauses. Consider these sentences:

25.	săreau	peste	obstacole,	se	dădeau	pe	*seesaw* ...
	jumped	over	obstacles	Refl	played	on	seesaw

'They jumped over obstacles, played on the seesaw …'

26.	m-am	dus	la	tata	să-i	vorbesc	despre
	Refl. have	gone	to	daddy	to him	talk	about

fountain pen.
fountain pen

'I went to daddy to talk to him about the fountain pen.'

In both of these cases, Romanian grammar dominates the sentence: the nouns following the prepositions *pe* 'on' and *despre* 'about' are indefinite, while English would require definite nouns in the corresponding structures. This situation is in line with the main premise of Myers-Scotton's *MLF* model (2006), namely that it is the matrix language of a bilingual clause that controls its grammar.

The indefinite article is also used or omitted before nominal switches according to Romanian rules, both with single and with multi-word insertions:

27. Ești *mouse*?
Are mouse?

'Are you a mouse?'

28. asta-l face să moară, că el e *dark creature.*
this him makes to die for he is dark creature

'This makes him die, because he is a dark creature.'

29. Și vinerea, ultima sa zi de *detention*, avea
And Friday the last his day of detention had

audition to be a keeper in quidditch.
audition to be a keeper in quidditch.

'And on Friday, his last day of detention, he had an audition to be a keeper in quidditch.'

The asymmetry of the languages participating in codeswitching and the dominant role played by one of these languages in setting the morphosyntactic frame of the sentence have been discussed by many authors in the literature. For example, Bentahilla and Davies (1983) believe that the elements from another language that can appear in a particular phrase are determined by the properties of the word heading that phrase. Consider the following examples from our data:

30. trebuia să ia canapeaua, s-o ducă peste casă,
had to take the couch to it take over house

și după aceea *in the front yard.*
and after that in the front yard

'They had to take the couch, you know, to take it over the house, and then in the front yard.'

31. le-o pus pe toate mobilele în *front yard,*
them has put on all the furniture in front yard,

și ăsta o crezut că trebuie să le ia.

and this has thought that must to them take

'They put all their furniture in the front yard, and this guy thought he was supposed to take it.'

When the English preposition is used as the head of the phrase, English syntactic rules dominate (*in* takes a definite noun object), whereas when the Romanian preposition is used, Romanian rules dominate (*în* takes an indefinite noun). Similarly, the occurrence of the indefinite article with *wasp invasion* in the two sentences below is determined by the grammar of each sentence: the article is omitted in the first part, when Romanian rules are in control, but it is used in the monolingual English sentence that follows:

32.	Problema	era	că	aveau	…	*wasp invasion.*
	The problem	was	that	had		wasp invasion

They had a wasp invasion, and they discovered that the wasps were in the chimney.

'The problem was that they had … a wasp invasion. …'

4.1.3 Word order

In Romanian, the subject can precede or follow the verb, whereas in English there is a strong preference for the subject to be placed before the verb. In our corpus, switched subjects, both single and multi-word items, are generally placed according to Romanian syntactic rules, mostly following the verb:

33.	dar	la	matrioșcă	nu	ar	merge	*cap*-ul.
	but	at	matryoshka	not	would	go	cap-Def.MSg

'But the cap wouldn't go on a matryoshka.'

34.	Și	după	aia	o	venit	*a lady,*
	And	after	that	has	come	a lady,

she was interested in a model coin that his uncle gave Greg, and she complained…

'And then a lady came,*…'*

Romanian and English also differ from each other with respect to the placement of demonstratives, possessives and adjectives. While Romanian

allows nouns to follow or to precede these words, in English the word order is more fixed, with demonstratives, possessives and adjectives preceding the noun. Switched elements in our data are placed according to Romanian word order, syntactic integration applying to single nouns as well as larger constituents. This situation supports the Morpheme Order Principle of the MLF model, according to which the matrix language is the source of word order in mixed constituents (Myers-Scotton 2006: 244):

35.	Și	după	aia,	o	vestuță	roșie	cu	*speckles*	albe.
	And	after	that	a	vest	red	with	speckles	white

'And then, a little red vest with white speckles.'

36.	venea	până	la	*waist*-ul	meu.
	came	up	to	waist-Def.MSg	my

'It came up to my waist.'

37.	luam	*treasure chest*-ul	ăla	mic.
	took	treasure chest-Def.MSg	that	small

'I used to take that small treasure chest.'

However, the occurrence of matrix language demonstratives and possessives with EL phrases is very restricted in our data. In fact, there is only one example of a switched NP used with a Romanian demonstrative (example 37) and no instance of multi-word switches accompanied by Romanian possessive adjectives. When the situation calls for these words, the preferred strategy is to produce larger switches that encapsulate them:

38.	am	vorbit	cu	ea	azi	despre	*our cleaning habits.*
	have	talked	to	she	today	about	our cleaning habits

'I talked to her today about our cleaning habits.'

39.	i-am	zis	despre	…	*that tightrope walker.*
	her have	told	about	...	that tightrope walker

'I told her about that … tightrope walker.'

A very common switch point in our data is between a Romanian indefinite article and an English noun, while switches of entire determiner + noun combinations are marginal. In detail, there are 66 English nouns

preceded by the determiner *un* 'a/ an', and only five occurrences of *a/ an* in front of a single noun switch. Both these situations are exemplified below:

40. Are așa un *ring* alb în jurul ochișorului.
Has so a ring white around the eye

'It has a white ring around its little eye.'

41. așa de mult luminează, încât *light*-ul
so much lights that light-Def.MSg

este mai mult *a material,* și te împinge *off.*
is more a material and you pushes off

'It lights so brightly that the light is more a material, and it pushes you off.'

These findings are consistent with the results of other studies, which show that, although nouns are switched freely inside NPs, determiners tend to come from the matrix language. For example, determiner-noun switches constitute the largest category in Bancu's data set of Romanian/ English intrasentential codeswitching (2013: 176) and are common in language pairs such as Spanish/ English (Timm, 1975) or Arabic/ French (Bentahilla and Davies, 1983).

As the codeswitched NPs become longer and more complex, the Romanian article becomes less common, while *a* and *an* increase in frequency:

42. un poster care arată un *food court,*
a poster that shows a food court,

că este un *hot dog stand in business.*
because is a hot dog stand in business.

'a poster showing a food court, because it is a hot dog stand in business.'

43. o noptieră care ar părea să fie *a glass cage,*
a night stand that would seem to be a glass cage,

with some pies inside, but those pies light up.

'a night stand that would seem to be a glass cage, with some pies inside, but those pies light up.'

Another common switch point in our data is between prepositions and nouns. Overall, there are more switches of English complements within Romanian PPs than switches at PP boundaries: our corpus contains 36 switches of PPs, while about a fourth of all English single nouns (73 in a total of 270) and a slightly higher percentage of English NPs (59 in a total of 131) are used as complements of Romanian prepositions. For example:

44. Era iarnă, iarnă fără *snow*.
Was winter, winter without snow.

'It was winter, a winter without snow.'

45. Sau poate se duceau în *bathroom stalls* învecinate.
Or maybe Refl went in bathroom stalls adjoining

'Or maybe they went to adjoining bathroom stalls.'

Sometimes, there is free variation between bilingual preposition + noun combinations and switches of entire English PPs. Consider the following examples:

46. o folosit asta în *self defense*.
has used this in self defense

'He used this in self-defense.'

47. puteai să folosești magia *in self defense*.
could to use magic in self defense

'You could use magic in self-defense.'

The structural similarity between the English *in self-defense* and the Romanian *în auto-apărare* facilitates the apparently random selection of the preposition. However, in general our data shows a marked preference for Romanian prepositions as heads of mixed PPs, even when they are both preceded and followed by English words:

48. ne-o zis încă un *news* din *her private life*.
us has told another news from her private life

'She told us another piece of news from her private life.'

Also consider the following example:

49.	*Fire*	în	*gems*	înseamnă	că,	atunci	când
	Fire	in	gems	means	that,	then	when

reflectă	lumina,	*it flashes very brightly.*
reflects	the light	it flashes very brightly.

'Fire in gems means that, when it reflects light, it flashes very brightly.'

Here there is a shared structure between *fire in gems* and the Romanian correspondent, *foc în pietre,* a situation which makes it easy for both languages to contribute words without any restrictions. The use of the Romanian preposition *în* supports the Uniform Structure Principle of the MLF model, which predicts that, in mixed constituents, grammatical elements will come preferably from the matrix language (Myers-Scotton, 2006: 243).

The employment of an English preposition is sometimes used as a strategy to avoid including the switched noun in any of the Romanian gender classes, especially when there are several competing factors that could influence this process. For example:

50.	Pot	să	scriu	două	bilețele,	și	să	le
	Can	to	write	two	notes	and	to	them

pun	într-o …	*in*	*a*	*hat.*
put	into-Def.FSg …	in	a	hat

'I can write two notes, and put them in a … in a hat.'

Here, the noun *hat* should be masculine based on its consonant ending, but feminine by analogy with the corresponding Romanian word, *pălărie.* The repair following *într-o* shows that the feminine gender is not considered acceptable, hence the switching of the whole phrase *in a hat*. However, the idea of prepositional phrases used as a means of "saving" switched nouns from being morphologically integrated should not be overemphasized, since most singular nouns in our data obtain masculine gender although they have feminine human referents or feminine Romanian equivalents. For example, the noun *exhibition* receives masculine gender in the sentence below, although, just like *hat* in (50), it has a feminine equivalent in Romanian:

51. taică-său lui Greg vroia să-l transforme
father his Def.MSg Greg wanted to it turn

într-un *exhibition* de *World War Two figurines.*
into-Def.MSg exhibition of World War Two figurines

'Greg's father wanted to turn it into an exhibition of World War Two figurines.'

Our data contains several examples of switches between prepositions and determiners (also see examples 38 and 39):

52. o punem pe *our naughty lists,* serios!
her put on our naughty lists, really!

'We'll put her on our naughty lists, really!'

53. casetuțe cu *the German word and the English translation*
boxes with the German word and the English translation

'little boxes with the German word and the English translation'

In general, mixed PPs headed by Romanian prepositions tend to occur as complements of verbs (see examples 51 and 52) or modifiers (examples 44 and 53), while switches of entire PPs are usually adjuncts, for example:

54. Și l-or audiat *in a proper courtroom,* everything.
And him have heard in a proper courtroom, everything.

'And they heard him in a proper courtroom, everything.'

55. îmi voi lega un șnur *at the waist.*
Refl.Dat will tie a string at the waist.

'I will tie a string around my waist.'

4.2 Adjectives and adjective phrases

Adjectives are the second largest category of English elements in our data: there are 162 single adjectives and 20 adjective phrases in a total of more than 700 switches. Some of these adjectives show a high frequency of occurrence (*cute, evil, tough, fair, cozy, funny*), but a very large number are used only once.

In Romanian, adjectives agree in number, gender and case with the nouns they modify; however, no English adjective in our data is morphologically adapted to Romanian.

4.2.1 Attributive adjectives

English adjectives are used both in the attributive and in the predicative positions, but switches inside NPs are much less common than those outside: only 31 single adjectives, representing about 20 percent of the total, occur in the attributive position, and only a limited number of these adjectives (less than 50 percent) are direct switches with Romanian nouns. All switched adjectives are placed on the right-hand side of the nouns they modify according to Romanian syntactic rules, a situation which supports the Morpheme Order Principle of the MLF model (Myers-Scotton 2006: 244):

56. eu am pornit de la o singură culoare *primary.*
I have started from one alone colour primary

'I started from only one primary colour.'

57. o zis să punem apă *clear.*
has said to put water clear

'She told us to use clear water.'

Romanian controls the order of words within mixed NPs even when both the head noun and the adjective are English:

58. și-o făcut un *dent* foarte *smooth.*
Refl. has made a dent very smooth

'He made himself a very smooth dent.'

Sometimes, there is free variation between an adjectivally modified English NP and a bilingual adjective + noun combination:

59. pe ălea mari voi lipi *googly eyes.*
on those big will stick googly eyes

'And on the big ones, I will stick the googly eyes.'

60. tre' să te confrunți cu ochișorii *googly.*
must to Refl. face with the eyes googly

'You must face the googly eyes.'

Although switching of English adjectives inside Romanian noun phrases is generally considered acceptable, our data contains more switches of entire adjective + noun phrases than switches between adjectives and nouns. In detail, there are 13 direct switches between Romanian nouns and English adjectives, 20 switches between English nouns and Romanian adjectives (see examples 35, 40, 45), but more than 40 combinations of English adjectives and English nouns, for example:

61. e așa, o *fun* *day.*
is so, a fun day

'It is a fun day, like this.'

62. dacă ar fi *brown* *wallpaper* *and* *hot* *yellow*
if would be brown wallpaper and hot yellow

furniture, *that* *would* *be* *really* *bad.*
furniture, that would be really bad

'If it were brown wallpaper and hot yellow furniture, that would be really bad.'

However, since many of these phrases are collocations (*the best part, the main thing, slow motion, open space, smiley face, googly eyes, real life*) with few novel combinations of the type exemplified in 62 above, it is debatable whether adjective + noun combinations are in general easier from a productive point of view than NP-internal switches. Based on the evidence in our corpus, we believe that switching between adjectives and nouns obeys no syntactic constraints other than those imposed by the grammar of the matrix language.

4.2.2 Predicative adjectives

Approximately 80 percent of the adjectives and adjective phrases in my data are predicates, for example:

63. deci îs destul de *unique.*
so are pretty *unique*

'So they are pretty unique.'

64. Dementorii au făcut ca totul să fie *pitch black.*

The dementors have made that everything to be pitch black.

'The dementors made everything pitch black.'

4.3 Verbs and verb phrases

Our data set contains 65 English verbs and verb phrases, mainly occurring in the subjunctive mood, but also in the indicative, conditional and imperative:

65. trebuie să *practice* ceva timp.
must to practice some time

'You must practice for some time.'

66. ezit și uneori chiar mai *stutter*.
hesitate and sometimes even stutter

'I hesitate and sometimes I even stutter.'

67. I'm warning you, nu mi-l *stretch*!
I'm warning you, not me.Dat it stretch

'I'm warning you, don't stretch (my sweater)!'

4.3.1 Morphological integration

Although Romanian finite verbs inflect for tense, number and person, very few switched verbs in our data are integrated into Romanian morphology. In detail, adapted forms represent less than 10 percent of the total of verbs in the corpus, and it is not clear why integration takes place in some cases but not in others. For example, some present tense indicative verbs receive Romanian inflections, while others remain uninflected in very similar syntactic contexts. Note the different behaviours of *top* and *trim* in the sentences below:

68. și îl *top*-ez, îl pict-ez de mână.
and it top-Pres.1Sg it paint-Pres.1Sg by hand

'and I top it, I paint it by hand.'

69. îl mai *trim* eu un pic.
it more trim I a little

'I trim it a little more.'

Similarly, most past participle and past tense verbs (11 out of 15) retain the *-ed* ending, and only a small number use Romanian inflections. Compare *stiffen*-it and *puzzled* below:

70. s-o mai *stiffen*-it.
Refl. has more stiffen-ed

'It has further stiffened.'

71. asta m-o *puzzled.*
this me has puzzled

'This puzzled me.'

The only factor that seems to play a role in the morphological adaptation of English verbs in our data is the presence of a complement immediately after the verb. Thus, English verbs followed by a direct object usually receive the necessary Romanian inflections whereas those used intransitively or preceded by pronoun objects remain uninflected. Consider these examples:

72. Și aș *dip*-ui carnea, știi, n-aș
And would dip-INFIN the meat you know not would

pune-o peste… aș *dip*-ui-o.
put it over … would dip-INFIN it

'And I would dip the meat, you know, I wouldn't put it over…, I would dip it.'

73. Dacă *sip* așa, nu de lângă lămâie, îmi place.
If sip like this not from near lemon Refl. like

'If I sip like this, not from near the lemon, I like it.'

Here, *dip* is followed by a direct object and therefore morphologically integrated, whereas *sip* is used intransitively and remains uninflected. In fact, only five English verbs in our corpus are followed by Romanian direct objects, and three of these verbs are morphologically integrated. An example is:

74. cred că am *trade*-uit câteva.

think that have trade-PTCP a few

'I think I have traded a few.'

On the other hand, most transitive English verbs are followed by English object nouns, many of the switched VPs in our data (8 out of 23) being verb + direct object combinations:

75. prima dată arată niște porumbei, știi,
first time shows some pigeons, you know

niște porumbei *pecking the ground.*
some pigeons pecking the ground

'First it shows some pigeons, you know, some pigeons pecking the ground.'

76. o paletă pe care o folosești să *flip pancakes.*
a spatula on which it use to flip pancakes

'one of those spatulas that you use to flip pancakes.'

Our data suggests the idea that the boundary between the verb and the direct object is a particularly difficult switch point, especially when the direct object is a clitic pronoun. For example, both *establish* in English and *stabili* in Romanian are transitive verbs; however, the use of the English past participle in the Romanian sentence below blocks the occurrence of a compulsory object clitic after this verb (as in **established-o*):

77. Nu mai are chef să-și care vata până în colț,

deci și-o *established* chiar în mijlocu' cușstii.
so Refl. has established right in the middle of the cage

'He doesn't feel like carrying the cotton to the corner, so he established (it) right in the middle of the cage.'

By contrast, the use of the morphologically and phonologically integrated form *dip*-ui in example 72 makes possible the switch with the Romanian clitic *-o* (*dip*-ui-o).

Romanian inflectional morphemes are never used on English verbs in the subjunctive mood following the particle *să:*

78. Stai numai să-mi termin *lesson*-ul,
Wait only to Refl.Dat finish lesson-Def.MSg

că altfel mă pune să *quit.*
for otherwise me put to quit

'Wait until I finish my lesson, because otherwise they'll make me quit.'

In her study of codeswitching involving first-generation Romanian/ English bilinguals in the United States, Bancu (2013: 179) finds the same lack of morphological integration of subjunctive verbs and explains it as the result of some perceived structural equivalence between the Romanian subjunctive and the English infinitive. The prevalence of unintegrated English verbs following the subjunctive marker in our data supports this idea; moreover, the equivalence between the two structures is confirmed by the occasional use of the English infinitive marker instead of the Romanian *să*:

79. ar fi cam greu totuși (pause)…
would be rather hard though (pause) …

to keep track of them.
to keep track of them

'However, it would be rather hard … to keep track of them.'

Although English past participle and past tense verbs generally retain the *-ed* ending in our data, occasionally, they lack any morphological marking at all, English or Romanian, especially when used in subordinate clauses. An example is *whimper* in this sentence:

80. deci poți să-ți dai seama că nu era foarte
so can to Refl.Dat realize that not was very

manly dacă *whimper* așa.
manly if whimper like that

'So you can imagine he wasn't very manly if he whimpered like that.'

The incidence of bare forms is higher for present tense indicative verbs, which rarely retain their *-s* ending or add Romanian inflections:

81.	Se	gândește	că	dacă	*sleep*	*out*	*in*	*the*	*open,*
	Refl.	thinks	that	if	sleep	out	in	the	open

o	să-l	*get.*
will	to him	get

'He thinks that if he sleeps out in the open, they'll get him.'

82.	Cel	mai	palpitant	se	întâmplă	când	o	găină	*escape.*
	The most		exciting	Refl.	happens	when	a	hen	escape

'The most exciting thing happens when a hen escapes.'

Myers-Scotton (2006: 258) explains bare forms as resulting from a lack of congruence between the structures of the matrix language and those of the embedded language. In our case, the typological difference between Romanian, a richly inflected language, and English, an isolating language, can be used to account for the insertion of embedded language verbs without the relevant inflections required by the matrix language. The influence of this variable on codeswitching patterns was studied by Bancu (2013) through the comparative method: looking at codeswitching data from two language pairs, Romanian/ Spanish and Romanian/ English, she finds more integration of Spanish than of English verbs in Romanian and explains this situation as resulting from the specific structural characteristics of the languages involved.

Other researchers see bare forms as indicative of a process of morphological convergence between the languages participating in codeswitching, rather than just of incongruence. For example, Schmitt (2000) believes that the omission of ML morphology on English nouns and verbs produced by Russian children in the United States shows convergence in the use of Russian towards English. Since codeswitching is often accompanied by convergence (Myers-Scotton, 2006: 271), it can be argued that the prevalence of bare verbs in our data might point towards a similar process of convergence of Romanian towards English in the speech of the studied child. Although convergence is outside the scope of this study, it is worth noting that our data contains evidence of English influence over Romanian in monolingual sentences as well as in mixed constituents. Consider the following example:

83.	l-au	încredințat	cu	o	mare	căutare.
	him.Acc have	entrusted	with	a	big	quest

'They entrusted him with a big quest.'

This clause is a syntactic calque on the English *They entrusted him with a big quest*; a standard Romanian construction would use a Dative pronoun to show the recipient of the action and a direct object to show the theme. In addition to this, the word *căutare* is a semantic calque on the English *quest,* but sounds odd in Romanian, a more suitable choice in this context being *misiune* 'mission':

84.	i-au	încredințat	o	misiune	importantă.
	him.Dat have	entrusted	a	mission	important

'They entrusted an important mission to him.'

Finally, Myers-Scotton (2002: 139) believes that the employment of bare forms, especially verbs, may reflect a lack of familiarity with "codeswitching as a medium of communication." She shows that verbs were mostly used uninflected in Spanish/ English corpora gathered before 2000, but are increasingly used inflected in newer corpora, a tendency which reflects speakers' growing awareness and understanding of codeswitching as a communicative strategy. Since the child studied in this paper does not belong to a bilingual community where codeswitching is the norm, this factor can be expected to play an important role in shaping her mixing preferences.

4.3.2 Syntactic integration

In Romanian, personal pronouns in the Accusative and the Dative frequently precede the verb when used in their weak forms, whereas in English they always follow the verb. The order of pronouns around English verbs is determined by Romanian syntactic rules, object pronouns being placed on the left-hand side of the verb, as predicted by the Morpheme Order Principle of the MLF model:

85.	Cabinetul	veterinary,	pot	doar	să-l	*wing.*
	The practice	veterinary	can	only	to it	wing

'The vet practice I can only wing.'

The occasional pauses and hesitations at the pronoun/ verb boundary do not indicate, in our opinion, any difficulty in switching at this site, but rather a difficulty in finding the right word or planning the rest of the sentence:

86.	Numai	anemonele	nu	pot	să	le	plantez	azi,

Only the anemones not can to them plant today

că trebuie să le … *soak* … în apă.
for have to them … soak … in water

'Only the anemones I cannot plant today, because I have to … soak … them in water.'

Another way in which the structural properties of Romanian are maintained in codeswitching situations is the use of English verbs with Romanian reflexive pronouns in contexts where these would occur in monolingual ML sentences. For example, the verb *climb* is not reflexive in English, whereas the Romanian corresponding verb *a te cățăra* 'to climb' is. Consequently, the English verb is used reflexively in a Romanian clause, such as in 87 below:

87. Dacă nu te-au văzut până acuma, te *climb*
If not you have seen until now Refl. climb

pe un *bridge* care produce zgomot.
on a bridge that makes noise

'If they haven't seen you yet, you climb a bridge that makes noise.'

The following example illustrates the way in which Romanian determines the grammar of a bilingual sentence containing English verbs: the switched subject noun in the first clause follows the verb *vine* 'comes', *notice* is used reflexively on the model of the Romanian *se observă*, and the Accusative pronoun *le* 'them' is placed on the left-hand side of *wrap around:*

88. Dacă vine *collar*-ul, nu se mai
If comes collar-Def.MSg not Refl any more

notice și o să le *wrap around.*
notice and will to them wrap around

'If the collar comes on, it won't be noticeable any more, and I will wrap them around.'

Conclusions

The analysis in this paper has shown that switching of English elements inside Romanian clauses takes place without violating the grammatical rules of the matrix language. Thus, English words and phrases

follow Romanian word order and well-formedness requirements, a situation which supports the general principles of the Matrix Language Frame model proposed by Myers-Scotton (2006) to explain intrasentential codeswitching.

However, the morphological assimilation of English switches to Romanian takes place in a limited number of cases, with nouns showing the highest degree of integration and verbs and adjectives the least conformity to matrix language morphology. We believe that the various factors discussed in the literature in relation to morphologically bare forms (convergence between the two languages, unfamiliarity with codeswitching as a communicative strategy) constitute interesting avenues for future research on Romanian/ English codeswitching.

References:

Bancu, A. (2013). A comparative analysis of Romanian-English and Romanian-Spanish code-switching patterns. In *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences: Illinois Working Papers.* 172-183.

Bancu, A. (2014). Language selection in code-switching: An analysis of nouns from Romanian-English code-switching. In *Texas Linguistics Forum,* 57. 13-24.

Beligan, A. (1999). Code-switching patterns in the speech of Romanian-English Bilinguals. In *Monash University Linguistics Papers*, 2 (2). 3-9.

Bentahila, A. & Davies, E. (1983). The syntax of Arabic-French code-switching. In *Lingua,* 59. 301-330.

Boumans, L. (1998). *The Syntax of Codeswitching: Analysing Moroccan Arabic/ Dutch Conversations.* Tilburg University Press.

Di Sciullo, A.M., Muysken P. & Singh R. (1986). Government and Code-Switching. In *Journal of Linguistics*, 22, 1-24.

Ene, E. (2001). Romanian-English Code-switching: A Preliminary Study. In *Journal of Second Language Acquisition and Teaching,* 8. 45-55.

Haugen, E. (1973). Bilingualism, language contact, and immigrant languages in the United States. In Sebeok, Thomas.A. (Ed.), *Current Trends in Linguistics*. Vol. 10. The Haugue: Mouton. 505-591.

Muysken, P. (2000). *Bilingual speech: A typology of code mixing.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Myers Scotton, C. (2002). *Contact Linguistics: Bilingual Encounters and Grammatical Outcomes*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Myers Scotton, C. (2006). *Multiple Voices: An Introduction to Bilingualism*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Myers Scotton, C. & Jake, J. (2017). Revisiting the 4-M model: Codeswitching and morpheme election at the abstract level. In *International Journal of Bilingualism,* 21 (3). 340-366.

Pârlog, H. (2004). Recent anglicisms in Romanian. In *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, 1(3). 207–218.

Petersen, J. (1988). Word-internal code-switching constraints in a bilingual child's grammar. In *Linguistics*, 26. 479-493.

Petrescu, M.C. (2014). *Minority Language Acquisition and Retention: A Study of Canadian-Born Romanian-Speaking Bilingual Children (Doctoral dissertation,* University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada). Retrieved January 10, 2022, from https:/ / tspace.library.utoronto.ca

Pfaff, C. W. (1979). Constraints on language mixing: Intrasentential code-switching and borrowing in Spanish/ English. In *Language*, 55. 291–318.

Poplack, S. (1980). Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish y termino en español: toward a typology of code-switching. *Linguistics*, 18. 561-618.

Schmitt, E. (2000). Overt and covert codeswitching in immigrant children from Russia. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 4(1), 9-28.

Șimon, S., Stoian E.C., Dejica-Cartiș A., Kriston, A. (2021). The Use of Anglicisms in the Field of Education: A Comparative Analysis of Romanian, German, and French. In *Sage Open*, 11 (4).

Timm, L.A. (1975). Spanish–English code-switching: el porque y how-not-to. In *Romance Philology*, 28. 473–482.

Treffers-Daller, J. (1994). *Mixing Two Languages. French-Dutch Contact in a Comparative Perspective*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Woolford, E. (1983). Bilingual code-switching and syntactic theory. In *Linguistic Inquiry*, 14. 520-536.

Zafiu, R. (2001). Păcatele Limbii: Între franceză şi engleză./ The Sins of Language: Between French and English. In *România literară*, 40. Retrieved March 20, 2022, from http:/ / www.romlit.ro/ index.pl/ ntre_francez_i_englez