

Kofi Yakpo, The University of Hong Kong

Code-switching and social change: Convergent language mixing in a multilingual society¹

Abstract: The majority of the population of Suriname uses elements stemming from at least two languages in everyday, informal interactions. While language contact between the languages of Suriname manifested itself chiefly through lexical borrowing in earlier times, the range of present contact phenomena also includes alternational and insertional code-switching, as well as code-mixing patterns shared across language boundaries. I analyze characteristics of the evolving mixed code that draws on Sranan and Dutch elements by looking at how it manifests itself in Sarnami, Surinamese Javanese and Sranan. I show that socio-economic changes in the past five decades with respect to urbanization, education, migration and mass media have contributed to obscuring ethno-linguistic boundaries, dramatically increased exposure to Dutch and Sranan, and driven the spread of language mixing practices into new domains. I conclude that mixing practices in Suriname are converging in a common communicative space that transcends linguistic boundaries.

1 Introduction

In the multilingual South American nation of Suriname code-switching between typologically and genealogically diverse languages is the norm, rather than the exception. The vast majority of Surinamese use elements stemming from at least two languages in everyday interactions. Code-switching in the following excerpt reflects the kind of societal multilingualism that characterizes Surinamese society:

¹ I am grateful to two anonymous reviewers for their valuable comments on an earlier version of this paper. The data on which this paper relies was collected with the support of the European Research Council “Traces of Contact” grant to Pieter Muysken at the Centre for Language Studies, Radboud University Nijmegen (www.ru.nl/linc). I am indebted to Renata De Bies, Helen Chang, France d’Oliveira, Lila Gobardhan-Rambocus, Jimmy Kasdipowidjojo, Motilal Marhé, Jit Narain and Antoon Sisal for their invaluable help in obtaining the data on which this paper relies.

- (1) SP1 1. tú aiye hiyan sab koi ***fuck-up*** kariye hiyan par.
 ‘you’ll come here and mess up everybody here.’
2. ***ahn, ye gi mi*** probleem.
 ‘**right, you’re giving me** problems.’
- SP2 3. is goed dan weet ik wel volgende keer.
 ‘it’s alright, then I know it for the next time.’
- SP1 4. ab tú janle, toch.
 ‘now you know, right.’

Excerpt (1) stems from a conversation between an employer (SP1) and his employee (SP2), in which SP1 tells off SP2. Large parts of the conversation are held in Sarnami, the primary language of much of the East Indian-descended community of Suriname. At the same time, there is code-switching from Sarnami to the English-lexicon creole language Sranantongo (also referred to as Sranan), as well as Dutch, the official language of Suriname. Sranan elements in excerpt (1) are in bold italics, Dutch elements are underlined, Sarnami elements are in regular font. Bilingual code-switching involving Sranan and Dutch or one of these two languages, as well as code-switching involving more than two languages is commonplace in Suriname. Code-switching in Suriname usually involves two constants, namely Sranan and Dutch, alongside a variable, one of the other languages of Suriname like Sarnami or Surinamese Javanese. On this backdrop, the following questions will be addressed in this article:

- What is the socio-historical background and present nature of multilingualism in Suriname?
- What kind of elements, structures and patterns characterize multilingual speech involving particular language constellations?
- How does linguistic convergence manifest itself in the range of mixing phenomena here referred to as borrowing, code-switching and code-mixing?
- What is the role of social change in the convergence of multilingual practices that typifies Surinamese society?

I will argue that the languages investigated (Sarnami, Surinamese Javanese and Sranan) show convergence in borrowing, code-switching and code-mixing. These three phenomena manifest themselves synchronically as a continuum of contact-related phenomena, but they are also linked diachronically (cf. Matras 2009). In this article, I focus on contact phenomena involving Sarnami and Surinamese Javanese next to Sranan and Dutch. Sarnami and Surinamese Javanese are little studied and this is the first analysis of code-switching involving these languages (the most comprehensive works to date on Surinamese Javanese and Sarnami are Vrugink 2001; Wolfowitz 1991; as well as Marhé 1985

and Santokhi & Nienhuis 2004 respectively). All examples in this paper stem from my field data gathered in Suriname.

The paper is structured as follows: In section 2, I discuss theoretical aspects of the concept of convergence and its application to code-switching. In section 3, I turn to the specificities of multilingualism in Suriname and the contribution of social change to altering the dynamics of language contact through time. Section 4 uses empirical data from multilingual interactions in Suriname in order to discuss the concepts of borrowing, code-switching and code-mixing. Section 5 concludes this study.

2 Code-switching, code-mixing and convergence in language contact

Before moving on to the specifics of code-switching in Suriname, I will briefly review concepts that are of importance for the ensuing presentation and discussion of data. The concept of convergence is employed in this paper in referring to three interlocked language contact phenomena in Suriname. It is used to refer to the emergence of a common stock of lexical items through borrowing in Sarnami, Surinamese Javanese and Sranan; it is used to refer to structural accommodation, i.e. the rise of common grammatical structures concomitant with societal multilingualism. Lastly, I employ the term convergence in the context of “code-mixing” characterised by patterned and systematic (i.e. “sedimented”, cf. Auer 1999) uses of non-native elements in multilingual interactions. This definition of convergence implies multidirectionality – more than two languages are involved in the processes and outcomes described – and multicomponentiality, hence covering lexicon, grammar and pragmatics. In its most common usage in historically oriented contact linguistics, the term convergence is more restricted in its use. It commonly refers to a diachronic process of contact-induced *grammatical* accommodation alone and in particular the emergence of new structures from multiple sources or in the case of two languages, mutual, hence also multidirectional accommodation (e.g. Thomason 2001). Multiple origin, multidirectionality and syncretism are the cornerstones of the concept of convergence that distinguish it from unidirectional borrowing from one language to another. Convergence is therefore a useful notion for understanding and describing the rather complex nature of contact processes and multilingual practices in Suriname that arise from the co-existence of two dominant languages, namely Dutch and Sranan, and their interaction with each other and the other languages of Suriname as donor *and* recipient languages.

Few studies have employed the term convergence for describing the emergence of common features during contact beyond the realm of morphosyntax and phonology (cf. Rickford 1987, for divergence in morphosyntax and simultaneous convergence in phonology). Muysken (2000) addresses synchronic aspects of convergence in code-switching. Convergence is, for one part, inherent in Muysken's term "congruent lexicalization", which describes a pattern of relatively constraint-free code-switching under structural and linear equivalence in the morphosyntax of the participating languages. Here, typological convergence of the grammatical systems of the (typically) two languages in contact is a *prerequisite* for congruent lexicalization. Typological similarity of the interacting languages, whether by accident or inheritance, therefore seems to play an important role in fixing the boundaries of the types of code-switching that speakers may resort to (cf. Muysken 2000; also the studies in Braunmüller 2009). The other determinant of particular code-switching patterns appears to be socio-functional. Stell (this volume) shows how code-switching patterns in South Africa involving the same language pair (Afrikaans and English) can be determined by differences in identity alignment. While a primarily alternational code-switching pattern is characteristic for white South Africans, a morpho-syntactically more intrusive, rather insertional code-mixing is more typical for black and "coloured" South Africans.

For Suriname, the opposite situation seems to hold. The typological differences between the three languages investigated here (Sarnami, Surinamese Javanese and Sranan) are considerable, and unlike Afrikaans and English, they do not belong to the same genetic groupings. Nevertheless, we witness an overall tendency towards linguistic alignment, which can be observed on the lexical plane, as well as structurally, in contact-induced morphosyntactic change (cf. Yakpo & Muysken 2014; Yakpo, van den Berg, & Borges 2014). Last but not least, the tendency towards the alignment of multilingual practices in the different constellations of languages in Suriname transpires in convergent code-mixing: We find a strong tendency for speakers of both Sarnami and Surinamese Javanese to render similar functions with the help of non-native, i.e. Sranan and/or Dutch items. At this point my analysis focuses on closed-class rather than open-class elements (e.g. numerals and pronouns) and grammatical rather than content words (e.g. modal auxiliaries and reciprocal pronouns). However, it is well possible that a more comprehensive analysis of open-class items could reveal equal tendencies for certain individual concepts or entire semantic fields to be predominantly denoted by non-native items.

Such code-mixed items are characterized by a certain degree of entrenchment, their use is conventionalized and they are not simply produced on the fly. They may however be substituted by native items, and they are every now

and then. The relative obligatoriness of a non-native item is probably not sufficient for drawing the notoriously fuzzy line between (incipient) borrowing and code-switching (e.g. Sankoff, Poplack, & Vanniarajan 1988; Myers-Scotton 1992; Van Hout & Muysken 1994; Romaine 1995; Poplack, Zentz, & Dion 2012) and a neat distinction between the two need not be necessary anyway in the unified perspective on contact that I adopt here (cf. also Backus, this volume; Treffers-Daller 1999).

A second, equally fuzzy boundary of relevance for the Surinamese contact scenario is that between the entrenched and systematic pattern of code-switching that I refer to as code-mixing in this article, and language mixing, i.e. the development and stabilization of a mixed language. Some authors have addressed the transition zone between the two latter phenomena (e.g. Auer 1999; Myers-Scotton 2003; Backus 2003; Meakins 2011). Meakins (2011) explores the rise of mixed languages through code-switching in more depth than previous studies in her landmark description of Gurindji Kriol, a mixed language spoken in Australia's Northern Territory. While some earlier studies reject the idea altogether that code-switching can contribute to the rise of mixed languages (e.g. Bakker 2003), others favour "insertional" over "alternational" code-mixing (cf. Muysken 2000) as the primary mechanism of code-switching that leads to language mixing (e.g. Auer 1999; Backus 2003; Myers-Scotton 2003). Meakin's (2011) study shows that both types of code-switching can contribute significantly to the shape of a particular mixed language. In section 5, I briefly discuss whether the data presented further below allows us to describe the Surinamese situation as one involving the emergence of one or several mixed languages.

Finally, it is useful to pose the question whether the mixing phenomena found in the socio-linguistically subordinate recipient languages in Suriname (i.e. all languages except Dutch) are not simply an epiphenomenon of various degrees of advancement of language shift. Studies have shown that intermediary stages of language shift and obsolescence (e.g. Aikhenvald 2012) can be characterized by the same kind of heavy structural and lexical borrowing that typify maintenance scenarios in which a recipient language is not threatened (for an illustrative example of the latter case, cf. Gómez-Rendón 2007). In the case of Surinamese Javanese, we seem to have both linguistic and sociological evidence that the language is losing its vitality. Sarnami, on the contrary, appears to be going strong and this is corroborated by the linguistic competence displayed by our Surinamese informants. Some Indo-Surinamese voices seem to be more pessimistic though, and see the existence of Sarnami threatened by the expansion of Dutch and Sranan (Motilal Marhé, Jit Narain p.c.).

3 Multilingualism and social change in Suriname

Suriname has been the scene of complex population movements throughout its history with corresponding patterns of societal multilingualism. Linguistic diversity has increased significantly since the beginning of the colonial period, reaching a peak in contemporary Suriname and ushering in the type of extensive language contact that characterizes the country today (for detailed overviews of multilingual Suriname, cf. Charry, Koefoed, & Muysken 1983; Carlin & Arends 2002).

The Portuguese, English and Dutch enslavement of Africans in Suriname led to the creation of Surinamese varieties of Afro-Caribbean English Lexifier Creoles, among them Sranan (Smith 1987, 2002). The nominal abolition of slavery in 1863 prompted the Dutch colonial regime to “import” indentured labourers from Asia, as in other plantation economies throughout the Caribbean (Saunders 1984; Kale 1998). In the Surinamese case, indentured labourers hailed from north-eastern India, Java (Indonesia) and southern China. Diverse northern Indian languages merged to form the koine Sarnami, which is today claimed as the first or a second language by a large part of the Indian-descended population of Suriname and about twenty percent of the total population of the country (SIC 213-2005). The Javanese language was also firmly implanted in Suriname and is claimed by about ten percent of the country’s population as a first or second language (*ibid.*). Like Sarnami, Surinamese Javanese has developed local characteristics that set it apart from Indonesian Javanese (cf. Gobardhan-Rambocus & Sarmo 1993).

Sranan and Dutch play an all-important role in Suriname. Sranan has evolved into a national lingua franca and is used by members of all social classes and ethnicities. Evidence from lexical borrowing in the languages of Suriname, which I will present in due course, seems to indicate that Sranan also constituted a prestige lect before the more recent expansion of Dutch.

Dutch has served as the only language of administration and education since colonial times. It has seen a steady growth in speaker numbers throughout the 20th century, especially after the independence of Suriname in 1975. The language has developed distinct characteristics in its lexicon and grammar that set it apart from European Dutch (cf. De Bies, Martin, & Smedts 2009; de Kleine 1999) and it is today used widely by all social classes including the working classes of the coastal belt. Most importantly, the high prestige of Surinamese Dutch gives the language a primordial role as a donor language to Sranan and other languages of Suriname.

The language contact scenario of coastal Suriname in particular is therefore characterised by a situation in which two languages, namely Sranan and

Dutch are functionally and numerically dominant and superposed to functionally more restricted languages. The two dominant languages are themselves once more hierarchically superposed to each other with Dutch occupying a superordinate and Sranan a subordinate position. This situation of three-tiered multiple language contact has the following implications for code-switching:

- Bilingual Dutch-Sranan code-switching occurs with speakers whose primary or community languages are the first and second tier languages Dutch and Sranan respectively.
- Trilingual code-switching involving Sranan and Dutch is commonplace with speakers of third tier languages like Sarnami, Surinamese Javanese, Hakka, Lokono, and Saramaccan.
- “Second order code-switching” (Meeuwis & Blommaert 1998) is common, in which an already mixed Sranan-Dutch code interacts with a third language.

Suriname went through significant socio-economic change in the 20th century. These changes have had consequences for the linguistic scenario. The changes are briefly summarized in the following:

- *Urbanization*: The ethnic spatial segregation of the colonial era has today been replaced by more mixed settlement patterns determined by social class rather than ethnicity (Hira 1998). The most dramatic changes in the proportion of the urban population were experienced by the Asian-descended communities. The rural settlement pattern inherited from the indenture period has today been largely dissolved with similar percentages of the total population of all coastal ethnic groups now residing in urban areas (which is principally the (peri-)urban zone of the capital Paramaribo)². Urbanization and spatial diversification have contributed significantly to the spread of Sranan and Dutch as interethnic lingua franca in the urban space.
- *Employment structure*: The bulk of the Surinamese workforce made a living in agriculture until well into the first half of the 20th century. After World War II, the proportion of the total workforce in agriculture declined rapidly. The growth of services and industry has led to an exponential increase of workforce mobility. This may have contributed considerably to the penetra-

² The percentage of the Indo-Surinamese urban population rose from 0 % in 1910, to 23 % in 1957, and to 70 % in 1993. The figures for the Javanese Surinamese urban population are 0 %, 11 % and 60 % respectively, that of the Afro-Surinamese urban population 59 %, 69 % and 70 % (Dusseldorp 1963; Hassankhan et al. 1995).

tion of Sranan and Dutch into once largely monolingual households, and particularly so in the formerly rural Asian-descended communities.

- *Education*: Access to Dutch-medium secondary and tertiary education saw a steady increase in the decades before and since independence. This has increased exposure to spoken and written Dutch, but has also increased possibilities for interaction in Sranan outside of the classroom.
- *Migration*: More than fifty per cent of people with Surinamese ties live outside of Suriname, with over ninety per cent of emigrants having settled in the Netherlands alone. Circular migration between Suriname and the Netherlands has increased exposure to Dutch, while migration between the coast and the interior has increased the presence of both Sranan and Dutch in Maroon and Indigenous communities (cf. Migge this volume).
- *Media*: The digital revolution and loosening of state control over audiovisual media has led to the proliferation of privately owned radio and TV stations. This has boosted the presence of a broader range of Surinamese languages in the public domain beyond the big two, Sranan and Dutch. It has also increased the presence of natural, colloquial speech, including code-switching and the use of different registers in programmes and advertising, thereby setting new standards of “acceptable” language use in the public domain.

The combined weight of the socio-economic and socio-cultural factors listed above has created a dynamic that has favoured the expansion of Sranan and Dutch into all ethnolinguistic communities and entrenched multilingual language practices across Suriname. As a consequence of these practices, Dutch has expanded into less formal domains formerly reserved to Sranan. At the same time, the use of Sranan is gaining ground in more formal domains once reserved to Dutch. The result is an increasing interpenetration of the functional domains of Dutch and Sranan.

4 From borrowing to code-mixing

In this section I try to show how extensive code-switching has led to the emergence of a common mixed code typified by continuities across different constellations of typologically diverse languages. This common code is based on a contact continuum ranging from more stable to rather flexible in terms of entrenchment. On the more stable end, we find a common core of shared borrowed lexical items and calques of Sranan and Dutch provenance. Such loans are entrenched and many speakers find it difficult to substitute them with

equivalent native lexical items. In the mid-range of stability, we find elements and structures that have a strong tendency to be non-native (i.e. are of Sranan and Dutch origin). This intermediate zone is the realm of code-mixing, characterised by the presence of the same non-native elements and structures in languages as different as Sarnami and Surinamese Javanese. Unlike borrowed items, code-mixed items are not obligatory, may sometimes be of *either* Sranan *or* Dutch origin and are often part of larger multiconstituent switches. The least stable part of the continuum in terms of entrenchment is code-switching proper, in which speakers either alternate between languages or insert non-native single or multiconstituent items.

The emergence of this mixed code involves the ongoing crystallization of a common even if partially variable core of mixed features. In the following, I focus on contact phenomena involving Sarnami and Surinamese Javanese as recipient languages, Sranan as a recipient and donor language and Dutch as a donor language.

4.1 The data

This study is based on field data gathered in Suriname between 2010 and 2012 by a team of researchers from Radboud University Nijmegen. Data was gathered on eight Surinamese languages: The Afro-Caribbean Creole languages Sranan, Ndyuka, Kwinti and Saramaccan, the Asian-descended languages Sarnami, Surinamese Javanese, Surinamese Hakka, as well as Surinamese Dutch. The corpus consists of a total of about a hundred and fifty hours of speech. The data was collected according to a unified methodology in order to allow comparison across varieties and languages. Data collection methods involved the use of broad (story-based) and narrow (video clip-based) visual stimuli on the one hand and (semi-)structured interviews and director-matcher tasks on specific topics on the other. Elicitation was complemented by recordings of natural discourse through participant observation in diverse settings such as work, during leisure time activities, in speakers' homes, etc. We also led about fifty sociolinguistic interviews in Sranan on the backgrounds of speakers and their language attitudes. About two-thirds of the corpus consists of elicited speech while the other third consists of naturalistic speech.

4.2 Borrowing

The most comprehensive dictionaries of Sarnami (Santokhi and Nienhuis 2004) and Surinamese Javanese (Vruggink 2001) contain hundreds of nativized items

of Sranan origin. It seems that due to its inaccessibility during the colonial period, Dutch played a less important role than Sranan as a donor to Sarnami and Surinamese Javanese. Not only are there far fewer established Dutch loans from that period. The phonological characteristics of many Dutch-derived items also point to them having been borrowed via Sranan rather than directly from Dutch (e.g. Sarnami *tafrá*, Surinamese Javanese *tafrah* < Sranan *tafra* < Dutch *tafel* ‘table’).

Table 1 below lists fully nativized loans of Sranan origin, chosen at random in order to represent different semantic domains. These items are either the only ones employed for the corresponding concepts or they constitute the first choice for our informants, even if a native item also exists (e.g. Sarnami *fruktu* < Sranan *fruktu* ‘fruit’ or the Indic synonym *phal* ‘fruit’). In the few cases in Table 1 where one of the recipient languages uses a native item as the default term, I include it in italics (e.g. *kagáj* ‘paper’). This does not, of course, exclude the possibility that the corresponding Sranan item is frequently used via insertional code-switching. The semantic characteristics of the loan words listed below seem to indicate that Sranan once constituted a prestige code. Hence not only was lexicon borrowed by Sarnami and Surinamese Javanese speakers in order to describe elements of a new natural habitat (a). We also find Sranan loan vocabulary from the field of (agricultural and construction) technology and aspects of urban life (b), as well as from social interaction (c):

Tab. 1: Sranan loanwords (Data from: Marhé 1985; Damsteegt and Narain 1987; GobardhanRambocus and Sarmo 1993, Vrugink 2001; Santokhi and Nienhuis 2004; field data).

Semantic domain	Sranan source	Surinamese Javanese	Sarnami	Gloss
a. habitat	abra	abrah	habará	other side
	bakra	bakrah	bakrá	white person
	busbusi	busbusi	busbusi	bush(y area)
	onti	onti	onti (kare)	hunt
	pranasi	pernangsi	parnási	plantation
	kasaba	kasabah	kasaba	cassava
	bergi	bergi	bergi	hill
	apra	apra	aprá	(star) apple
	fruktu	fruktu	fruktú	fruit
	kraka	krakah	kraka	fork (tree)
	kanti	kanti	kanti	side, place
b. technology & urban life	tiki	tiki	tiki	(small) stick
	mesre	mésré(man)	mésréman	bricklayer
	papira	papirah	<i>kagáj</i>	paper
	datra	<i>dokter</i>	datrá	doctor

Semantic domain	Sranan source	Surinamese Javanese	Sarnami	Gloss
	banti	banti	banti	tyre
	baskita	baskita	baskitá	basket
	blaksmit	blaksmit	<i>lohár</i>	blacksmith
	smeri	semir	smeri (kare)	(to) smear
	kukru	<i>pawon</i>	kukru	kitchen
	sroisi	sorsi	soroisi	sluice
	oto	<i>montor</i>	oṭo	car
	strati	<i>jalan</i>	stráti	street
	forku	<i>porok</i>	forku	fork
	lesi	lesi	<i>paṛhe</i>	read
	bedi	bedi	bedi	bed
	tafra	tafrah	tafrá	table
	bangi	bangi	báangi	bench
	fensre	fěnsré	<i>khirki</i>	window
	yuru	yuru	yuru (kare)	hire, rent
	froisi	<i>alih</i>	froisi (howe)	move house
	legi	legi	legi	empty
	boro	boro	boro (kare)	take short cut
c. social interaction	dwengi	dwéngi	dwengi (kare)	(to) force
	sorgu	sorgu	sorgu (kare)	care for, treat
	spang	spang	spáang	tense, tension
	lobi	lobi, <i>demen</i>	lobi (kare)	(to) love
	lesi	lesi	lesi (rahe)	(be) lazy
	begi	bégi	begi (kare)	ask, beg for
	breiti	breiti	breiti	(be) content
	dipi	dipi	dipi, <i>gahir</i>	deep; complex
	lespeki	lespéki	<i>ádar</i>	respect
	hebi	hebi	hebi	heavy, difficult

The items in Table 1 above under (b) and (c) are of particular interest because their transfer from Sranan may not exclusively be attributed to need. The fact that semantically so heterogeneous words were transferred from Sranan could be attributed to the similarity of the socio-economic conditions that the Sarnami-speaking and Javanese-speaking communities were subjected to (i.e. plantation labour, initial rural habitat, followed by rapid urbanization). But this fact alone cannot explain how words denoting aspects of social interaction like *breiti* ‘be content’, or *lesi* ‘be lazy’ made their way into both languages. This circumstance rather seems to point to the emergence of a common communication space from quite early on after the arrival of the Asian immigrants, one that encompassed speakers of (at least) the three relevant languages. Large-scale societal multilingualism and society-wide code-switching would not have

been necessary for such borrowing from Sranan to take place. Even in cases of extensive lexical borrowing, a small but influential proportion of (passive) bilinguals is sufficient to introduce non-native lexical items into a language (cf. e.g. Sakel 2007: 25).

I should mention that Dutch today plays at least as important a role as a donor of lexical material as Sranan. Bi- and trilingual switching has led to a common set of heterogeneous Dutch items and calques being found across Sarnami, Surinamese Javanese and Sranan (cf. Yakpo, van den Berg, & Borges 2015 for examples).

4.3 Code-switching

Code-switching is present in our data in all three languages and we find insertional as well as alternational code-switching. Surinamese Javanese, Sarnami and Sranan differ, however, with respect to how inserted material is integrated. Further, although all three languages feature alternational mixing, Javanese Surinamese speakers are the only ones in our corpus to show a considerable amount of repair-related switching. I assume this to be a symptom of an ongoing language loss and shift from Surinamese Javanese to Sranan and Dutch among some segments of the Javanese Surinamese population.

Non-native elements, be they verbal or nominal in character are carried over into Surinamese Javanese without the use of special, integrating morphology. In the following example, the non-native Sranan noun *planga* ‘plank’ is inserted and morphosyntactically integrated into the Surinamese Javanese noun phrase, as can be seen by the presence of the native nominal suffix *-(a)n*.³ The example also involves an alternational switch to Dutch following the clausal boundary (indicated by the comma), i.e. there is no overt syntagmatic integration into the preceding Surinamese Javanese structure:

- (2) terus intuk *planga-n* terus yâ, eindelijk het lukt.
 then get plank-N then INT finally it succeeds
 ‘then (he) gets the plank, then yes, finally, it [he] succeeds.’

A conspicuous feature of insertion into Sarnami clauses is the requirement that Dutch or Sranan verbs be integrated via auxiliary constructions featuring the

³ Henceforth I employ the following conventions in rendering trilingual codeswitched passages: material in Sranan is set in *bold italic*, material in Dutch is underlined, the base language is in regular type.

generic verbs *be* and *do*. The auxiliary verbs are inflected while the non-native verb is (in the case of the verb-inflecting language Dutch) inserted either in the infinitive form or in the 3sg present tense form. This constraint is probably due to the fact that Sarnami has no verb-deriving morphology except valency operations. The presence versus absence of auxiliary constructions is however not useful for distinguishing between loans and switches in Sarnami, since there are many native items that also require auxiliaries in order to form the predicate of a clause.

The speaker in the following excerpt is telling her friend how she is going to spend her Saturday. We find the usual presence of switched pragmatic elements (*echt* ‘really’) and progressions (*zaterdag* ‘Saturday’). The Dutch verb *uitslapen* ‘sleep in’ is integrated into the verb phrase with the help of the Sarnami generic verb *kare* ‘(to) do’ (infinitive). Note the position of the generic verb *kare* in the construction, following the verbal complement, which is consistent with Sarnami (and Indic) SOV word order:

- (3) a. sowieso zaterdag ke ham sabere kaprá dhobe, hamke echt dher kaprá rahá dhowe ke.
 ‘Anyway on Saturday, I’ll wash clothes, I really have a lot of clothes to wash.’
- b. ham eerst apan kaprá dhobe ham kuch kháik banábe, sanjháke mángilá uitslapen kare.
 ‘I’ll first wash my clothes, (then) I’ll prepare some food, (then) in the afternoon I want to sleep in.’

Sranan verbs are morphologically invariant. They however also appear in a helping verb construction in Sarnami, as in the following example featuring the Sranan verb *verfi* ‘(to) colour’, which is a complement to the inflected Sarnami auxiliary *bhail* ‘(has) be(en)’. Once more note the presence of further switched constituents, in this case pragmatic elements, Sranan (*ma* ‘but’) and Dutch (*wel* ‘actually’):

- (4) SP1 kaun wálá damrú, ego haigá jaun meṅ ná *verfi* bhail, *ma* ego wel hai.
 ‘Which (kind of) damru drum, there’s one which is not **coloured but** one actually is.’
- SP2 háṅ jaun ná *verfi* bhail.
 ‘Yes, the one that’s not **coloured**.’

Turning to alternational code-switching, repair-related alternation is particularly present in the data of younger Surinamese Javanese speakers. There are indications that a considerable proportion of younger speakers of Surinamese

Javanese (i.e. roughly below thirty years of age) are shifting to Sranan and Dutch. One indicator of this development is a somewhat restricted competence of some of our respondents, which transpires particularly during elicitations requiring the use of more specialized lexicon and grammar. In the following excerpt, the speaker (female, 26 years old) shifts to Dutch each time she experiences retrieval difficulties. In this case, it seems that the speaker has problems in expressing a Source-oriented locational structure ('it doesn't want to fall off (the tree)). Also note the presence of the common loan *tiki* 'stick' (cf. table 1):

- (5) a. sing liyané lungâ menèh njukuk *tiki* .
 'the other one goes again to take the *stick*.
 b. maar die trui wil nog steeds niet eraf .
 'but the sweater still doesn't want to come off [the tree].'
 c. liyané njukuk *tiki* sing gedé.
 'the other one takes another stick.'
 d. en de trui kan nu pas eraf en een van ze draagt die trui.
 'and the sweater can only now come off and one of them puts on the sweater.'

The data also contains numerous episodes in which code-switching is less functional in appearance and is not employed to fulfil specific discourse-pragmatic or participant-related functions (cf. Auer 1998 for the distinction between the two types of code-switching). Such episodes of natural and informal interaction between speakers appear to be characterised by the kind of multilingual interaction that has been referred to as "unmarked" (Meyers Scotton 1993; Amuzu, this volume).

The following Sarnami excerpt is an example of unmarked code-switching. It stems from a conversation between two friends. One (SP1, female, 28 years) gives directions to her house to the other (SP2, female, 25 years).

- (6) SP1 1. dus gewoon calat jaiye, tab ego *kerki links* ki *rechts*.
 'So just keep on walking, then (there's) a church, left or right.'
 2. ná sun, *na* pahile, eerste blokwá meñ ego *kerki* bá tab gewoon voorbij
die kerk dan rechts pe nummer vier en veertig pe ham báti.
 'no, listen, *in* the first block, there's a church, so just past that church then
 on the right we're at number forty-four.'

SP2 3. aur jaun hiyan se buswá ja haigá, u zeker jáigá Heiligenweg?
and the bus that leaves from there, that certainly goes to Heiligenweg?

In this particular instance, switching primarily takes place between Sarnami and Dutch, to the exception of the noun *kerki* ‘church’ and the general locative preposition *na* ‘loc’. The excerpt above shows central characteristics of Surinamese-style unmarked multilingual practice:

- Frequent back and forth-switching within a single sentence
- Intense use of alternation next to insertion, cf. sentence 2–3 in particular – Doubling of individual items or the approximative reiteration of larger units, cf. *pahile* ‘first’ (Sarnami) and *eerste* (Dutch), *kerki* ‘church’ (Sranan) and *kerk* (Dutch) in sentence 2
- Frequent use of switched pragmatic elements, cf. *ma* ‘but’, *boi* ‘boy’ (Sranan); *dus* ‘so’, *dan* ‘then’, *gewoon* ‘just’, *zeker* ‘certainly’ (Dutch)
- Occurrence of code-mixing, i.e. elements from particular semantic domains or expressing particular functions are predominantly non-native, cf. *links* ‘left’, *rechts* ‘right’, *nummer* ‘number’, *vier en veertig* ‘forty-four’, *zaterdag* ‘Saturday’.

The occurrence of code-mixing is covered in more detail in the next section. Before moving on, I should mention that the kind of code-switching we have seen so far is characteristic of natural, institutionally unmonitored speech as it occurs in settings rather low in formality. Naturally, normative expectations about “correct” language use may severely restrict code-switching in more formal domains, for example, in school, church, or in Parliament.

4.4 Code-mixing

I showed in the preceding section that biand trilingual code-switching is a common phenomenon in the linguistic communities this data was gathered in. I will now argue that the threshold has been crossed from code-switching to code-mixing. A mixed code has evolved that draws on Sranan and Dutch as donor languages and features a common pool of non-native elements. I will focus on three features of this mixed code as they manifest themselves in Sarnami, Surinamese Javanese and Sranan.

I refer to switching between languages as code-mixing where I am able to show that there is a preference for the use of non-native forms in particular functions. This phenomenon involves convergence because the elements and

features of this mixed code are found across different recipient languages. Some of the structures described involve a higher degree of morphosyntactic integration, and can therefore be said to involve insertion (cf. Muysken 2000: 63). This is for example the case with the occurrence of Dutch and Sranan reciprocal pronouns as verbal arguments. Other code-mixing patterns may involve both alternational and insertional patterns, for example the use of Dutch numerals in temporal adjuncts but also as quantifiers in argument NPs.

The latter type of code-mixing involves the use of numbers and other progressions, like day names. In these domains, Dutch is the exclusive donor language. This is without doubt due to the fact that Dutch is the sole medium of instruction in Surinamese schools, so numeracy skills are only acquired through and in Dutch. In the following excerpt, SP2 (speaker 2) uses a Dutch expression for a higher number (*zeven en twintig* ‘twenty seven’) and Sranan for low numbers (*tu* ‘two’, *siksi* ‘six’). The general tendency is for numbers below five to be primarily expressed by native items. The relative frequency of native numerals decreases thereafter and the likelihood for numbers higher than ten to be rendered by a native term is very low. Example 6 above (sentence 2) shows the use of a high Dutch numeral (*vier en veertig*) and example 21 further below that of a low native numeral (*dui-duigo*) in Sarnami:

- (7) 1 SP1 *yu abi pikin?*
 ‘do you have children?’
- 2 SP2 *mi abi tu boi dya, a frow lon gwe na Holland nanga a wan boi, mi no si*
 a boi zeven en twintig yari.
 ‘I had **two** boys here, the woman ran off to Holland with one boy,
 (and) I didn’t see the boy for twenty seven years.’
3. *a boi ben abi **siksi** mun, ma dati na a famiri fu a frow ben bumuy ini a tori.*
 ‘the boy was **six** months old, but it was the woman’s family that got involved
 in the matter.’

Table 2 below lists further domains for which I have identified the existence of code-mixing, as well as the respective donor languages. Note that Sranan is of course also a recipient language for Dutch material, either through mixing (e.g. the use of Dutch TMA auxiliaries) or through borrowing.

In the following, I will focus on two mixed auxiliary constructions that serve to express aspectual and modal functions respectively. I then move on to describe the use of mixed reciprocal constructions.

In Dutch, the adjective *bezig* ‘busy’ expresses continuous aspect when used as a predicate adjective, followed by a prepositional phrase introduced

Table 1: Domains of codemixing

Domain	Donor language
Loan words & calques	Sranan, Dutch
TMA auxiliaries	Sranan, Dutch
Reciprocal pronouns	Sranan, Dutch
Numbers/Progressions	Dutch
Pragmatic elements	Sranan, Dutch
Intonational patterns	Sranan

by *met* ‘with’ containing a gerundival form of the main verb, i.e. *hij is bezig met schrijven* ‘he’s busy (with) writing’. The *bezig* construction is found in Sarnami, Surinamese Javanese and Sranan, where it is morphosyntactically adapted in various ways in each recipient language. In all three languages, the construction appears in an imperfective context characterized by continuity of a deliberate action by an animate subject. Examples 8 and 9 feature excerpts from elicited speech. We find the *bezig* construction in all three languages, and in the very same context, although the elicitation sessions took place separately from each other, and involved different pairs of speakers for each language. Both excerpts feature the use of *bezig* in Sarnami. Also note the numerous Dutch insertions (underlined):

- (8) SP1 en volgens mij ú batiyá hai, want okar munh beweeg howe hai,
 au bezig hai kuch likhe ke ego schrift men.
 ‘and I think he’s conversing, because his mouth is moving, and
 he’s busy writing something in a handwriting.’

SP2 au ú echt vlot likhe haigá, zonder dat ú sonce ú kauncí likhe hai.
 ‘and he’s writing really fast, without him thinking what he’s writing.’

- (9) ego aurat akele ego kamrá men haigá, bezig bá kuch likhe ke,
 au ú echt snel-snel likhe haigá.
 ‘a woman is alone in a room, she’s busy writing something,
 and she’s really writing fast.’

The constructions above are only partially calqued on Dutch. In both examples *bezig* occurs as a predicate adjective, as a complement to one of the Sarnami copulas *hai* ‘be.PRS’ (ex. 8) and *bá* ‘be.PRS.3 (ex. 9). However, the Dutch prepositional phrase is not replicated in Sarnami. Instead, the main verb is expressed

as an infinitive, as shown by the presence of the postposition *ke* (*likhe ke* ‘to write’).

The following example from Surinamese Javanese involves the aspectual auxiliary *bezig* followed by a Sranan main verb (*skrif* ‘write’) and its Sranan object complement (*brifi* ‘letter’). This time, *bezig* is treated like a verb – Javanese does not have a morphosyntactically distinct class of predicate adjectives (cf. Ewing 1999: 95). The Dutch prepositional structure is not calqued here either, instead the main verb *skrif* ‘write’ appears in its bare form and is best seen as non-finite.

- (10) ènèk wong bezig, nganu, *skrif brifi* karo pulpèn.
 ‘A person is busy, like, *writing a letter* with a ballpen.’

The following example is from Sranan. The *bezig* construction once more partially follows a Dutch structure. We find *bezig* occurring as a predicate adjective and complement to the Sranan copula *de*. The main verb *skrif* ‘write’ is however linked to the preceding auxiliary via the imperfective marker *e* ‘IPFV’ rather than a prepositional phrase.

- (11) SP1 wan frow de bezig e skrif wan sani tapu wan papira.
 ‘A woman is busy writing something on a (piece of) paper.’
- SP2 wan brifi, kon taki so.
 ‘A letter, it seems.’

In sum, the existence of native predicate adjective constructions Sarnami and Sranan allows these two languages to partially calque the corresponding Dutch structure. In Javanese Surinamese however, *bezig* is treated like a verb, since this language does not employ copulas in the relevant contexts. Beyond that, all three languages employ complement-like structures rather than Dutch-like prepositional structures to link the main verb to the auxiliary. The uniformity of the adaptation strategy across the three languages leads me to conclude that there is a diffusion from Sranan in the way the *bezig* construction is adapted. If this is indeed the case, then the process of adaptation is not dissimilar to the one involving borrowing by Sarnami and Surinamese Javanese of Dutch-derived lexicon via Sranan discussed above.

This leads us to the function of the construction. It seems that in Sarnami and Surinamese Javanese the construction is specialized to imperfective contexts in which we find high agentivity (i.e. voluntariness of the subject, anima-

cy, etc.). Such a function can seemingly not be covered by other imperfective nuances in the languages concerned and the Dutch structure is a convenient means of filling this functional ‘gap’.

A second instance of conventionalized code-switching is the use of the modal auxiliary *pruberi* (Sranan) and *probeer* (Dutch), both of which mean ‘try to’. Our data shows a preference by Javanese Surinamese and Sarnami speakers to employ non-native forms to express conative modality. The following excerpt from an elicited conversation in Sarnami exemplifies the use of the conative modal auxiliary (lines 1 and 3). Note that the non-native verb *pruberi* is always integrated via the generic verb *kare* ‘do’, as are other non-native verbs. The Sarnami corpus of about forty thousand words contains twenty two instances of *probeer/pruberi* and eleven instances of the native equivalent (*kausis/kosis kare*, lit. ‘make effort’).

- (12) 1 SP1 are, hán *ma* i hoop ná op déi acchá, phir *pruberi* karí.
 ‘hey, yes, *but* he’s not going to give up hope, he’s going to *try* again.’
- 2 SP2 calánk hai sára, *ma* abki kar lei acchá.
 ‘he’s clever, the shithead, *but* this time he’s going to do it well.’
- 3 SP1 are, ab phir *pruberi* karí.
 ‘right, now he’s going to *try* again.’

Speakers seem to shift freely between the Dutch form (*probeer*) and the Sranan equivalent (*pruberi*). The two forms are of course related – Sranan has borrowed this verb from Dutch – and the similarity of the Sranan and Dutch forms often leads to the appearance of phonologically intermediate forms (e.g. *prober*, *prubeer*), as in (13):

- (13) sab probeer kare hai, kude ke, sab manier *prubeer* kare hai nikáse ke.
 ‘he’s trying everything, (like) jumping, he’s trying every method to remove it.’

Surinamese Javanese speakers also employ the Dutch verb *probeer* or its Sranan reflex *pruberi* in the same functions as Sarnami speakers. In the Surinamese Javanese corpus of about twelve thousand words, there are eight occurrences of *probeer/pruberi* against four occurrences of the native equivalent *jajal*. Example (14), is part of a Surinamese Javanese speaker’s depiction of the same scene as the one rendered by the Sarnami utterances in (12) above:

- (14) arep probeer menèh, terus tibâ menèh, dijupuk menèh, saiki tikusé ndelok,
dijupuk menèh, diwalikwaliki.
'he's going to try again, then it falls again, it is picked up again, now the mouse looks,
it is picked up again and flipped over.'

The following example shows the same Surinamese Javanese speaker making use of the verb *jajal* 'try (to)' (here with the transitivity prefix {n-}). In both languages, the non-native form can therefore be replaced with a native one, even if the figures show a clear preference for the non-native form (native forms in regular bold font in all following examples):

- (15) arep **njajal** njukuk kaosé *ma* ora inter, omdat uwité dhuwur.
'He's going to try to take the shirt, *but* he can't because the tree is (too) high.'

I now move from the verbal to the nominal domain. The expression of reciprocity is also characterized by the emergence of a mixed practice, in which speakers of Sarnami and Surinamese Javanese draw on non-native elements. These mixed structures are, as in the case of the other elements discussed, not obligatory and may involve either Sranan or Dutch elements. The corresponding native structures are however used to a far lesser extent in our corpus, and for many speakers are probably not considered the default means of expressing reciprocity.

Both Sarnami and Surinamese Javanese make use of either the Dutch reciprocal pronouns *elkaar/mekaar* 'each other' or the corresponding Sranan form *makandra*. The excerpt in example (16) shows the use of *elkaar/mekaar* as a prepositional adjunct (sentence 1), and as an argument (sentence 2 and 3). Note that the appearance of *mekaar* in an argument position entails the use of a Sarnami postposition (the accusative/dative marker *ke*), while the adjunct features the Dutch preposition *met* 'with':

- (16) 1 SP1 aur ekwá **kantiyá** ego admi ego dúsar londá met elkaar batiyá hai.
'and on the other [check] side one man (and) another boy are
are conversing with each other.'
2. ta sab koi mekaar ke kuch dewe hai, jaun dúigo baiṭhal haigá.
'then they are giving each other something, the two who are conversing.'

- 3 SP2 chaunriyá bhí kuch dewe haigá, aur duígo londwan bhí elkaar ke kuch dewe hai.
 ‘the girl is also giving something, and the two boys are also giving each other something.’

In Surinamese Javanese, we find a similar pattern. When a non-native reciprocal pronoun appears in a prepositional phrase, the preposition is usually also non-native. Compare example (17) sentence (a), featuring the Dutch reciprocal pronoun *elkaar*, with sentence (b), featuring the Sranan equivalent *makandra*. The two sentences were uttered consecutively by the same speaker and in response to a video clip stimulus:

- (17) a. wong lanang karo wong wèdok jagong tegen elkaar.
 ‘A man and a woman are sitting against each other.’
 b. wongé [check] ora weruh ná een lange tijd, ngerangkul *makandra*.
 ‘They haven’t seen (each other) after a long time, (and) are hugging *each other*.’

I will dwell briefly on the native means of expressing reciprocity in Sarnami and Surinamese Javanese in order to show how code-mixing is leading to a fundamental change in the way reciprocity is expressed in these two languages. There are three native strategies of expressing reciprocity in Sarnami. The first involves the use of the bipartite quantifier NP *ek dusre* (lit. ‘one the other’), as in (18):

- (18) **ek dusre khát** pathá-we haigá boek-wá
 one other for send-INF be.PRS book-DEF
 ‘they’re sending [passing on] the book to one another.’

Most speakers consulted however consider the use of *ek dusre* to be formal language. A more common alternative is the use of a quantifier NP consisting of a reduplicated form of *ekwá* ‘other’, as in (19):

- (19) **ekwá-ekwá** ke daur-á-we.
 other-RED ACC/DAT run-CAUS1-INF
 ‘they’re chasing one another.’

Another means of expressing reciprocity involves the use of the reflexive pronoun *apne* ‘self’. This strategy is usually complemented by the use of redupli-

cation of other clausal constituents in order to emphasize the pluractional character of the predication. In (20), the locative noun *páche* ‘behind’ is reduplicated, and in (21), it is the numeral *dui* ‘two’ that gets reduplicated.

(20) u sab **apne** ke **páche-páche** daure hai.
 DIST all REFL ACC/DAT behind-RED run be.PRS
 ‘they are running after each other.’

(21) hinyá par **dúi-dúi**-go **buku apne** men **leun** kar ke
 here on two-RED-CLF book REFL in lean ‘do’ ACC/DAT
 dhar-al bá.
 put-PFVP be.PRS.3
 ‘here, books have been placed (there) with them leaning against each other in pairs.’

It is noteworthy that the two native strategies of Sarnami are for one part composite, they involve the use of several elements instead of a single one. Secondly, they involve elements (i.e. the reflexive pronoun) or morphological processes (i.e. reduplication) that are not exclusively dedicated to the expression of reciprocity.

The native strategy of expressing reciprocity in Surinamese Javanese involves the use of a multifunctional item as well: The verbal detransitivizing suffix *-(a)n*, also often in combination with verbal reduplication may express reciprocity besides various other derivational, often pluractional meanings, such as sociative (‘do sth. together’), positional (‘to (continue) occupying a certain posture’), etc. (cf. Robson 1992: 50–52, 97). The following two sentences, uttered by the same speaker during an elicitation session, exemplify the native strategy in Surinamese Javanese.

(22) 1. wong lanang karo wong wèdok **lèndèn-lèndèn-an**.
 person male with person female lean-RED-AN
 ‘a man and a woman are leaning (against) each other.’

2. pàdâ, pàdâ **rangkul-rangkul-an**.
 same same hug-RED-AN
 ‘the same (people) are hugging each other.’

Sarnami and Surinamese Javanese therefore do not express reciprocity through monomorphemic (and invariant) forms. The semantically more diffuse nature of reciprocity expression in Sarnami and Surinamese Javanese, and the morphosyntactic complexity of its formation may help explain the attractiveness

of employing single non-native elements like *elkaar* and *makandra*, both of which are semantically unambiguous and dedicated to a single function.

The Sranan reciprocal pronoun *makandra* is also an old borrowing from Dutch (<Dutch *elkander* ‘every one (the) other’). There are good indications that economy and transparency motivations might also have been at play in Sranan in the integration of *makandra* in Early Sranan. The use of a reflexive *cum* reciprocal pronoun is actually also found in contemporary Sranan, even if it is very rare in the corpus.

Compare the following two sentences, the first of which (example (23)) features the reciprocal pronoun *makandra*. It is noteworthy that Sranan, like Sarnami and Surinamese Javanese, may also make additional use of verbal reduplication to express the mutuality of the event denoted by the verb:

- (23) den tu man e kruderi-kruderi nanga makandra
 def.PL two man IPFV negotiate-RED with each.other
 ‘the two men are negotiating with each other.’

The second sentence (example 24) features the reflexive strategy: reflexivity/reciprocity is expressed through an object NP consisting of the pronominal and reflexive anaphor *srefi* ‘self’ and a preceding coreferential possessive pronoun as the subject, in this case *den* ‘3PL’. This sentence is potentially ambiguous between a reciprocal and reflexive reading.

- (24) so den no e si den srefi èn den e plei
 so 3PL NEG IPFV see 3PL self and 3PL IPFV play
 leki na wip.
 like LOC see-saw
 ‘so they don’t see **each other** [or **themselves**] and they’re playing like on a see-saw.’

The use of a single non-native element like *bezig* or *makandra* to express semantically complex notions seems to be a comfortable alternative to the use of circumlocution (i.e. “scattered” coding, cf. Aikhenvald 2003) involving several multifunctional elements. However, an explanation that draws on need or transparency (cf. e.g. Johanson 2002) as a motivation for code-mixing can only be part of the story. The Dutch/Sranan conative modal auxiliary is preferred to native alternatives in Sarnami and Surinamese Javanese although there are structurally and functionally similar options.

We must assume therefore, that a variety of other, usage-based factors (cf. Backus, this volume) co-determine the selection of particular forms during code-mixing. Among these factors, we could count the combined high textual frequency of the formally and semantically convergent Dutch and Sranan forms *pruberi* and *proberen*.

5 Discussion and conclusion

In the preceding sections, I have looked at multilingual practices involving four languages of Suriname, three of them as recipient languages (Sarnami, Surinamese Javanese and Sranan), and two of them as donor languages (Sranan and Dutch). I have identified a number of socio-cultural-historical and demographic factors at work in the Surinamese scenario. These factors appear to favour the emergence and maintenance of common practices of borrowing, multidirectional code-switching, and code-mixing across languages that are typologically quite different. The convergence of these practices has led to a common communicative space that transcends social, ethnic, and linguistic-typological boundaries. The Surinamese data highlights the crucial role that social factors can play in determining the types and outcomes of language mixing practices:

- (a) *Social change*: The last fifty years or so have been marked by fundamental social change in Suriname with respect to urbanization, access to education and mobility. Cultural and linguistic patterns appear to cluster increasingly around social class rather than ethnicity (cf. e.g. Hira 1998).
- (b) *Social networks*: Suriname is a 'small' society with about half a million inhabitants and a highly mobile population. Social networks are therefore naturally more multiplex, the possibilities for lingua-franca-based interaction across ethno-linguistic boundaries is correspondingly higher than in larger societies.
- (c) *Relative group size*: The two largest ethnolinguistic groups in Suriname (Indo-Surinamese and coastal Afro-Surinamese) make up just about half the population of the country (cf. SIC 213-2005). The other half is made up of other ethnolinguistic groups of considerable strength – only the various Indigenous Amerindian groups are very small in number. This circumstance has favoured the maintenance of linguistic diversity on the one hand and the use of lingua francas on the other.
- (d) *Language attitudes*: Dozens of interviews conducted by us in Suriname on language attitudes with members of most linguistic communities and from a representative cross-section of society revealed language attitudes that placed a positive value on societal and individual multilingualism, showed flexible views towards normativity and a generally pluralistic outlook on culture and social relations.
- (e) *Multilingual proficiency*: Surveys by the Nederlandse Taalunie (Kroon & Yagmur 2010), Léglise & Migge (2011), as well as our own interviews reveal a high degree of multilingual proficiency in Suriname, and in the two lingua francas Sranan and Dutch across all ethnolinguistic groups.

Linguistic convergence therefore seems to have occurred alongside a general convergence of socio-economic and socio-cultural patterns in Suriname. In this sense, the code-switching described in this chapter may be seen to belong to an ensemble of multilingual practices that are constitutive of a specifically Surinamese identity.

I have identified three types of multilingual practices in particular: (1) borrowing, i.e. the lasting integration of Sranan items in the Sarnami and Surinamese Javanese lexicon; (2) insertional and alternational code-switching; (3) code-mixing: a preference for the use of specific non-native elements and constructions in Sarnami, Surinamese Javanese and Sranan clauses. Convergence is the common theme uniting these three language mixing practices. Convergent borrowing is evident in the existence of a common stock of Sranan loanwords in Sarnami and Surinamese Javanese. Convergence in code-switching is manifest in the strong presence of alternational code-switching in all language constellations, next to insertional code-switching patterns, in which the same non-native items are used in the same functions.

In this context, the question arises whether the presence of these multilingual practices in Sranan, Surinamese Javanese and Sarnami make these languages qualify as “mixed languages” to some degree (cf. Yakpo and Stell, this volume; O’Shannessy, this volume; classical studies such as Muysken 1981 (*Media Lengua*), Bakker 1997 (*Michif*), Mous 2003 (*Ma’a/Mbugu*)).

The Surinamese scenario is better seen as a case of extensive borrowing and mixing rather than one of (a) stabilized mixed language(s). I have shown that mixing is systematic and affects specific items and constructions. At the same time, most mixed structures can be expressed via native counterparts. Mixing is therefore optional, even if highly conventionalized and entrenched. Further, mixing in the Surinamese languages shows a tendency towards compartmentalization, e.g. the use of Dutch numerals is pervasive and so is the use of specific Dutch and Sranan temporal and modal auxiliaries. However, mixing has not expanded to all or at least the majority of elements in a particular functional domain or sub-system. Finally, although the mixed lects that I have described have become the default lect for a large section of Suriname’s population, and the youth in particular, most Surinamese also speak the two major source languages Sranan and Dutch as *lingua francas* next to other community languages.

Another question worth deliberating is how stable code-switching and code-mixing practices in Suriname actually are in a diachronic perspective. Is it possible that switching practices in Suriname are merely an epiphenomenon of language shift, as shown for other contact scenarios (e.g. Lavandera 1978; Trudgill 1976–1977; Bentahila & Davies 1991)? There are no indications that

Sranan is losing its vitality. However, if the situation in neighbouring nations with a similar socio-history and one-time higher linguistic diversity is anything to go by, then there is reason to assume that a shift (to Sranan and Dutch) is inevitable not only in the case of Surinamese Javanese, but also with a seemingly stable language like Sarnami (for the fate of the Indic varieties in Trinidad and Guyana, see Mohan 1990 and Gambhir 1981 respectively). In that case, we would need a more thorough investigation of possible differences between code-switching and code-mixing as practised by shifting versus ‘maintaining’ speech communities in Suriname. If the non-dominant languages of Suriname are indeed shrinking at the expense of Sranan and Dutch, then the pan-Surinamese convergence phenomena described in this chapter should be seen as transitory, and primarily reflecting the encroachment of Sranan and Dutch upon the other languages of Suriname.

Abbreviations

1	1 st person
3	3 rd person
ACC/DAT	accusative-dative marker
DEF	definite article/marker
DIST	distal demonstrative
INDF	indefinite article
INF	infinitive
INT	interjection
IPFV	imperfective aspect
LOC	locative preposition
NEG	negator
OBJ	object
PL	plural
POSS	possessive
PFVP	perfective participle
PRS	present tense
PST	past tense
REFL	reflexive pronoun
SG	singular
SBJ	subject
SP	speaker

References

- Aikhenvald, A. V. & B. M. W. Dixon. 2003: Evidentiality in typological perspective. In Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald & R. M. W. Dixon (eds.), *Studies in evidentiality*, 1–31. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2012: Language contact in language obsolescence. In Claudine Chamoreau & Isabelle Léglise (eds.), *Dynamics of contact-induced language change*, 77–110. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Auer, Peter. 1999: From code-switching via language mixing to fused lects: toward a dynamic typology of bilingual speech. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 3(4): 309–332.
- Auer, Peter, Frans Hinskens, & Paul Kerswill. 2005: *Dialect change: Convergence and Divergence in European Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Auer, Peter 1998: Introduction: Bilingual conversation revisited. In Peter Auer (ed.), *Code-switching in conversation: language, interaction and identity*, 1–24. London: Routledge.
- Auer, Peter. 1999: From code-switching via language mixing to fused lects: Toward a dynamic typology of bilingual speech. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 3(4): 309–332.
- Bakker, Peter. 1997: *A language of our own: the genesis of Michif, the Mixed Cree-French language of the Canadian Métis*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bentahila, A. & E. E. Davies. 1983: The syntax of Arabic-French code switching. *Lingua* 59(4): 301–330.
- Berselaar, D. van den, H. Ketelaars, & L. G. Dalhuisen. 1991: *De komst van contractarbeiders uit Azië : Hindoestanen en Javanen in Suriname*. Leiden: Coördinaat Minderhedenstudies, RUL.
- Bies, R. de, W. Martin, & W. Smedts. 2009: *Prisma woordenboek Surinaams Nederlands*. Houten: Prisma Woordenboeken en Taaluitgaven.
- Braunmüller, K. 2009: Converging Genetically Related Languages: Endstation Code Mixing? In K. Braunmüller & J. House (eds.), *Convergence and Divergence in Language Contact Situations*, 53–69. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Carlin, E. B. & J. Arends (eds.). 2002: *Atlas of the Languages of Suriname*. (Caribbean Series). Leiden: KITLV Press.
- Charry, E., G. Koefoed, & P. Muysken. 1983: *De talen van Suriname: Achtergronden en ontwikkelingen*. Muiderberg: Coutinho.
- Damsteegt, T. 1988: Sarnami: A living language. In R. K. Barz & J. Siegel (eds.), *Language transplanted: The development of overseas Hindi*, 95–119. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Damsteegt, T. & J. Narain 1987: *Ká Hál: Leerboek Sarnami (Surinaams Hindostaans)*. Den Haag: Nederlands Bibliotheek en Lektuur Centrum.
- Dusseldorp, D. van. 1963: Geografische mobiliteit en de ontwikkeling van Suriname. *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Landen Volkenkunde* 119: 1.
- Ewing, Michael C. 1999: *The Clause in Cirebon Javanese Conversation*. PhD dissertation, University of California (Santa Barbara).
- Gambhir, S. K. 1981: *The East Indian Speech Community in Guyana : A Sociolinguistic Study with Special Reference to Koine Formation*. PhD thesis, University of Pennsylvania.
- Gobardhan-Rambocus, L. & J. Sarmo. 1993: Het Surinaams Javaans. In L. Gobardhan-Rambocus & M. S. Hassankhan (eds.), *Immigratie en ontwikkeling. Emancipatieproces van contractanten*, 184–201. Paramaribo: Anton de Kom Universiteit.

- Gumperz, John & Robert Wilson 1971: Convergence and creolization: A case from the IndoAryan/Dravidian border. In D. Hymes (ed.), *Pidginization and Creolization of Languages*, 151–168. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hassankhan, M., M. Ligeon & P. L. H. Scheepers 1995: Sociaal-economische verschillen tussen Creolen, Hindoestanen en Javanen : 130 jaar na afschaffing van de slavernij. In L. Gobardhan-Rambocus, M. Hassankhan, & J. L. Egger (eds.), *De erfenis van de slavernij*, 249–274. Paramaribo: Anton de Kom Universiteit. <http://repository.ubn.ru.nl/handle/2066/14380> (27 February, 2014).
- Hira, S. 1998: 125 jaar sociaal-economische ontwikkeling van de Hindostanen in Suriname. In M. S. Hassankhan & S. Hira (eds.), *Grepen uit 125 jaar maatschappelijke ontwikkeling van Hindostanen: van Gya en Boodheea tot Lachmon en Djwalapersad*, 10–24. Paramaribo: IMWO Nauyuga and Amrit.
- Hout, Roeland van & Pieter Muysken. 1994: Modeling lexical borrowability. *Language Variation and Change* 6(1): 39–62.
- Johanson, Lars. 2002: *Structural Factors in Turkic Language Contacts*. London: Curzon.
- Kale, M. 1998: *Fragments of Empire: Capital, Slavery, and Indian Indentured Labor Migration in the British Caribbean*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Kleine, C. M. de. 1999: *A Morphosyntactic Analysis of Surinamese Dutch as Spoken by the Creole Population of Paramaribo, Suriname*. City University of New York.
- Koning, A. de. 1998: Als jij Ram bent ... : veranderingen in het leven van Hindostaanse vrouwen in Paramaribo vanaf de jaren vijftig. In M. S. Hassankhan & S. Hira (eds.), *Grepen uit 125 jaar maatschappelijke ontwikkeling van Hindostanen: van Gya en Boodheea tot Lachmon en Djwalapersad*, 159–189. Paramaribo: IMWO Nauyuga and Amrit.
- Lavandera, Beatriz. 1978: The variable component in bilingual performance. In James E. Alatis (ed.), *International Dimensions of Bilingual Education*, 391–409. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Léglise, Isabelle & Bettina Migge. 2011: Language practices and linguistic ideologies in Suriname: Results from a school survey. <https://halshs.archives-ouvertes.fr/halshs00673158/> (16 November, 2014).
- Marhé, R. M. 1985: *Sarnami byakaran: Een elementaire grammatica van het Sarnami*. Leidschendam: Stichting voor Surinamers.
- Matras, Yaron. 2009: *Language Contact*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Mayer, M. 1969: *Frog, Where Are You?* New York: Dial Press.
- Meeuwis, Michael & Jan Blommaert. 1998: A monolectal view of code-switching: Layered code-switching among Zairians in Belgium. In Auer, Peter (ed.), *Code-switching in conversation: language, interaction and identity*, 76–100. London: Routledge.
- Migge, Bettina & Isabelle. Léglise. 2011: On the emergence of new language varieties: The case of the Eastern Maroon Creole in French Guiana. In L. Hinrichs & J. Farquharson (eds.), *Variation in the Caribbean: From Creole Continua to Individual Agency*, 181–199. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Mous, Maarten. 2003: *The Making of a Mixed Language: The case of Ma'a/Mbugu*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Mohan, Peggy. 1990: The rise and fall of Trinidad Bhojpuri. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 85: 21–30.
- Muysken, Pieter. 1981: Halfway between Quechua and Spanish: the case for relexification. In Albert Valdman & Arnold Highfield (eds.), *Historicity and variation in creole studies*, 52–78. Ann Arbor: Karoma.

- Muysken, Pieter. 2000: *Bilingual Speech: A Typology of code-mixing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Myers-Scotton, Carol. 1993: *Social Motivations for Code Switching: Evidence from Africa*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Poplack, S, L. Zentz, & N. Dion. 2012: Phrase-final prepositions in Quebec French: An empirical study of contact, code-switching and resistance to convergence. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 15(2): 203–225.
- Rickford, John 1987: Are black and white vernaculars diverging In Ralph W. Fasold et al. (eds.), *Are Black and White Vernacular Diverging? American Speech* 62: 55–62.
- Robson, Stuart. 1992: *Javanese grammar for students*. Monash Papers on Southeast Asia 26. Monash University.
- Sakel, J. 2007: Types of loan: Matter and pattern. In Y. Matras and J. Sakel (eds.), *Grammatical Borrowing in Cross-Linguistic Perspective*, 15–29. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Sankoff, David, Shana Poplack, & Swathi Vanniarajan. 1990: The case of nonce loan in Tamil. *Language Variation and Change* 2: 71–101.
- Santokhi, E. & L. J. A. Nienhuis. 2004: *Sarnami woordenboek: Een tweetalig woordenboek van het Surinaams Hindostaans*. Den Haag: Communicatiebureau Sampreshan.
- Saunders, K. 1984: *Indentured Labour in the British Empire, 1834–1920*. London: Croom Helm.
- SIC 213-2005/02: *Zevende algemene volksen woningtelling in Suriname, landelijke resultaten, volume I, demografische en sociale karakteristieken* (7th general population and household census in Suriname, national results, volume 1, demographic and social characteristics). Paramaribo: Algemeen Bureau voor de Statistiek.
- Smith, N. 1987: *The Genesis of the Creole Languages of Surinam*. PhD thesis, University of Amsterdam.
- Smith, N. 2002: The history of the Surinamese creoles II : Origin and differentiation. In E. B. Carlin & J. Arends (eds.), *Atlas of the languages of Suriname*, 131–151. Leiden: KITLV Press.
- Thomason, Sarah Grey. 2001: *Language contact: an introduction*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Treffers-Daller, Jeanine. 1999: Borrowing and shift-induced interference: contrasting patterns in French–Germanic contact in Brussels and Strasbourg. *Bilingualism, Language and Cognition* 2: 77–80.
- Trudgill, Peter. 1976–1977: Creolization in reverse: reduction and simplification in the Albanian Dialects of Greece. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 7: 32–50.
- Vruggink, Hein (in collaboration with Johan Sarmo). 2001: *Surinaams-Javaans-Nederlands woordenboek*. Leiden: KITLV Press.
- Wolfowitz, Clare. 1991: *Language style and social space: stylistic choice in Suriname Javanese*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Yakpo, Kofi & Pieter Muysken. 2014: Language change in a multiple contact setting: The case of Sarnami (Suriname). In Isabelle Buchstaller, Anders Holmberg & Mohammad Almoaily (eds.), *Pidgins and Creoles beyond Africa-Europe encounters*, 101–140. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Yakpo, Kofi, Margot van den Berg, & Robert Borges. 2015: On the linguistic consequences of language contact in Suriname: The case of convergence. In Eithne Carlin, Isabelle Léglise, Bettina Migge, & Paul Tjon Sie Fat (eds.), *In and out of Suriname: Language, mobility and identity*, 164–195, DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/97890042800120_009. Leiden: Brill.