ALEXANDER ANDRASON
Stellenbosch University
andrason@sun.ac.za
ORCID: 0000-0002-8507-9824

СAШКO-LECT: THE TRANSLANGUAGED GRAMMAR OF A HYPER MULTILINGUAL GLOBAL NOMAD PART 3 – CONTACT LANGUAGES AND TRANSLANGUAGING

Abstract

This study examines the idiolect of Сашко – a hyper-multilingual global nomad whose language repertoire draws on forty languages, ten of which he speaks with native or native-like proficiency. By analyzing grammatical and lexical features typifying Сашко's translanguaging practices (code-switches, code-borrowings, and code-mixes), as documented in the corpus of reflexive notes that span the last twenty-five years, the author designs Сашко's translanguaged grammar. Instead of being a passive additive pluralization of separated, autonomous, and static monolects, Сашко's grammar emerges as a deeply orchestrated, unitary, and dynamic strategy. From Сашко's perspective, this grammar constitutes a tool to express his rebellious and defiant identity; a tool that – while aiming to combat Western mono-culturalisms, compartmented multilingualisms, and nationalisms – ultimately leads to Сашко's linguistic and cultural homelessness. This paper – the last in a series of three articles – is dedicated to Сашко's mixed languages and translanguaged grammar typifying Сашко-lect in its integrity.

1. Introduction

The present study, divided into a series of three papers, is dedicated to Сашко-lect or the idiolect of Сашко – a hyper-multilingual global nomad whose language

repertoire draws on forty languages, ten of which he speaks with native or native-like proficiency. In the previous two articles, I presented the methodological foundations of my research and examined the language-contact mechanisms of code-switching and borrowing operating in discourses produced by Сашко. The present article – the last in the series – deals with issues that emerge at a higher level of analysis where a more global, synthetic, and unitary perspective is adopted, where both grammatical and extra-grammatical properties are taken into consideration, and where the speaker with his context – not only his language – is in focus. Specifically, in Section 2, I analyze mixed languages developed by Сашко. In Section 3, I determine the properties of translanguaged grammar that typifies Сашко-lect in its integrity. In Section 4, I formulate my conclusion and raise some new questions that result from this research.

2. Contact languages of Сашко-lect

Apart from making common use of mechanisms of code-switching and borrowing, discourses produced by Сашко also attest to larger, more consistent, and more stable linguistic structures. In such cases, instead of constituting variations of their sources elaborated by erratically interchanging different (matrix and/or embedded) codes or incorporating a few elements of a donor code in the dominant frame of a recipient code, two contributing codes form a more coherent, permanent, balanced, and even structure – a novel language system, a mixed language (ML) (cf. Thomason 2001; Matras 2009; Meakins 2013; Velupillai 2015).

The mixed languages used by Сашко have been developed through the blending of named languages that are either (nearly-)native to Сашко or are mastered by him with high proficiency. All of them have emerged during Сашко's residence in the countries in which one (and sometimes both) source codes are in daily use. One group of mixed languages includes systems that draw on named languages of the immediate "exit" and "entry" countries – i.e. the country which Сашко left and the country to which he just moved. For instance, the Icelandic-Swedish ML was elaborated while living in Iceland after coming back from Sweden; and the Spanish-Icelandic ML was elaborated while living in Spain having moved from Iceland. Another group of mixed languages includes systems that draw on two named languages simultaneously present in an "entry" country, e.g. the Mandinka-English ML – developed while living in Eastern Gambia where both Mandinka and English are in daily use; and the English-Xhosa ML – while living in the Western Cape in South Africa where both English and Xhosa are used. The last group includes systems that combine the named language of the "entry" country with another named language that is only used in restricted contexts in the host country (e.g. at schools and working places, in family, and immigrant communities). For example, the Polish-French ML – while living in Poland and interacting with his French-speaking mother; and the English-Lingala ML – while living in South Africa and interacting with Congolese immigrants.

Each of Сашко's mixed languages has emerged in the context of prolonged and intense bilingualism, as is typical of mixed languages in general (cf. Thomason 2001: 197; Matras 2009: 291; Meakins 2013: 159, 188; Velupillai 2015: 69, 81). Therefore, the formation of Сашко's mixed languages has never been driven by communicative needs or imperfect language acquisition – again in full compliance with the usual behaviour of mixed languages (cf. Thomason 2001: 197; Matras 2009: 290; Meakins 2013: 181). In no cases have Сашко's mixed languages resulted from grammatical errors or lack of linguistic knowledge. Indeed, Сашко could always have used the languages that contributed to a particular mixture in their standard forms. The motivation for the development of Сашко's mixed languages has been different. Сашко's mixed languages have mostly been developed emblematically to mark a new hybrid identity. Indeed, identity shift and acculturation have played important roles in the formation of Сашко's mixed languages. Alternatively, in a few instances, the use of a particular mixed language was prompted – or at least further encouraged – by the wish to keep conversations secret and purposefully exclusive to outsiders. All such motivations are viewed as common in the emergence of mixed languages (cf. Thomason 2001: 198; Matras 2009: 288–291, 304–306; Meakins 2013: 181–183, 216; Velupillai 2015: 69–70, 77–80). Overall, the resultant blends are intentional and controlled. Сашко has ingeniously played with his languages by consciously manipulating their elements. This intentionality and control are visible in the relatively deliberate selection of the grammar and lexicon of a particular mixed language from distinct sources, resulting in a more or less careful compartmentalization of the contributing languages.

As can be inferred from the notes underlying my corpus, and corroborated by Сашко himself in recordings, the formation of Сашко's mixed languages mainly follows a unidirectional evolutionary route (on this type of genesis of mixed languages consult Muysken 2000; Thomason 2001: 205; Meakins 2013: 187; Velupillai 2015: 81). That is, Сашко's mixed languages tend to result from the regularization, conventionalization, and entrenchment of code-switching into relatively predictable patterns. This change inversely involves the weakening of spontaneous variations and pragmatic nuances typical of code-switching. If preserved, the equivalent structures of the source languages become more specialized – the presence of each being governed by a specific grammatical rule. In general, the "ancestral" code gradually shifts to the new language – the "target" code of the new country that Сашко has moved to or the community with which he has started interacting – stopping, however, half-way (compare with Meakins 2013: 187; Velupillai 2015: 81).[1]

---

[1]   However, a particular mixed language, on the one hand, and code-switching (as well as borrowing), on the other hand, are not mutually exclusive. On the contrary, the mechanisms of code-switching and borrowing typically coexist alongside Сашко's language mixing, accompanying his mixed languages at any point of their entire grammatical life – even at the peak of a mixed language's entrenchment and stabilization. In other words, Сашко's discourses do not equal closed linguistic systems, be it code-switching, borrowing, or mixed language. Instead, they constitute fluid circuits of language choices. Mixing found in Сашко-lect is always notably "multilayered" (cf. Matras 2009: 298).

Very sporadically, Сашко's mixed languages seem to have emerged by following a fusional route (regarding this type of genesis, consult Bakker, Muysken 1995; Bakker 1997: 210; 2000; 2003; Thomason 2001: 206; Meakins 2013: 195–197; Velupillai 2015: 81, 83) being created in a more spontaneous and catastrophic manner.

As is typical of mixed languages in general (cf. Thomason 2001: 197; Matras 2003: 158; Meakins 2013: 188, 190), in Сашко's mixed languages – at least globally, when all the varieties are considered jointly – all features can be blended irrespective of their grammatical, lexical, and morphological type, and irrespective of the typological distance between the source languages concerned.[2] Accordingly, the mixing involves not only referential lexemes (e.g. the Spanish verbs *saber* 'know' and *dejar* 'leave' and the Icelandic verbs *vita* 'know' and *fatta* 'understand' in (1)) or functions that are absent in one of the source languages (e.g. the sentence introducer *es que* used in Colloquial Spanish but absent in Icelandic, that heads the sentence in (1)). It may also affect syntax, word order, deep word structure and bound morphology, including derivation and inflection (e.g. *fattas* composed of the Icelandic root *fatta* 'understand' and the Spanish 2sg. ending *-(a)s*).

(1)   Spanish-Icelandic ML

Es que hverning[IC] podía vita[IC] que hann[IC] og[IC] ég[IC] lo habríamos dejado seinna[IC]. Ég[IC] no lo sabía eins[IC] og[IC] hann[IC] no lo sabía. Svona[IC] es þetta[IC]. Ef þú no lo fatta[IC]s[IC] hvað[IC] puedo ég[IC] þá[IC] segja[IC].

'It is that… how could I have known that he and I would have broken up later. I didn't know it just like he didn't know it. It is like that. If you don't understand it, what can I then say.'

As is typical of the unidirectional route (cf. Thomason 2001; Meakins 2013; Velupillai 2015), which, as mentioned above, is generally followed by Сашко's mixed languages, the intertwining of the source languages is intense, and the compartmentalization of grammatical and lexical material is messy. That is, both lexicon and grammar, form and structure, content-reference items and predication-anchoring components, as well as noun phrases and verb phrases have dual origin. This type of structure is common if the source languages are similar from a typological point of view, particularly if they belong to the same branch of closely related languages, e.g. Icelandic and Swedish, Spanish and French, Polish and Russian. The examples below, which contain excerpts from the Spanish-French ML (2.a) and the Polish-Russian ML (2.b), illustrate this messy intertwining of sister source codes. In the Spanish-French ML, Spanish mainly donates word order, pronouns (*yo* 'I', *me* 'me', *quien* 'who'), auxiliary and copula verbs (*puedo* 'I can' and *es* 'is'), conjunctions (*y* 'and'), prepositions (*en* 'in', *a* 'to'), and the first part of negation (*no* 'not'). The TAM semantics of verbs generally match the usage found in Spanish rather than in French

---

2   Some of Сашко's mixed languages exhibit preferences for the compartmentalization and the separation of grammatical and lexical material. The compartmentalization of others is messier and less neat (see further below in this section).

(cf. *quien saurá* whose TAM meaning reflects a modal function of the future tense in Spanish: *quien sabrá* 'who can/could know it'). French, in turn, principally donates inflected verbs (*deteste* 'I/it hate(s)', *saurá* 'he will know'), most nouns (*païs* 'country', *Europe* 'Europe', *Afrique* 'Africa'), and the second part of negation (*pas*). It also contributes to other categories, albeit to a lesser extent than Spanish, e.g. certain pronouns (especially in constructions that are absent in Spanish: *moi* in *à moi* 'for/to me' and *m(e)* in *m'en irai* 'I'll go/leave'). Furthermore, certain elements may be attributed to Spanish and French simultaneously as their graphic forms (although not necessarily their pronunciations) are identical in both languages, e.g. *que* 'that', *si* 'if', *un* 'a'. In the Polish-Russian ML, Polish donates most inflected verbs (*pojadę* 'I'll go (by car/train/plane)', *pójdę* 'I'll go (by walking)', *zapytam* 'I'll ask'), a few (usually abstract) nouns (*pomysł* 'idea'), prepositions (*na* 'to'), conjunctions (*i* 'and', *jak* 'if'), particles (*czy* 'whether', *to* 'then'), and adverbs (*spoko* 'ok, well'). Russian donates most pronouns (*меня* 'me', *я* 'I', *они* 'they', *это* 'it'), most nouns, especially concrete nouns (*университет* 'university') and place names (*Украину* 'Ukrainę'), response words (*да* 'yes' and *нет* 'no'), and sporadically adverbs (*тоже* 'too'), conjunctions (*как* 'when'), and prepositions, especially in idiomatic expressions (e.g. *у меня есть* 'I have').[3]

(2) a. Spanish-French ML

Yo no puedo fair^FR lo pas^FR. Vivre^FR en un païs^FR que yo deteste^FR y que me deteste^FR à^FR moi^FR, no es possible^FR pas^FR. M'en^FR irai^FR a un otro païs^FR …si no en Europe^FR peut-être^FR en Afrique^FR. Quien saurá^FR?

'I cannot do it. It is impossible to live in a country that I hate and that hates me. I will go to a different country…if not in Europe, perhaps in Africa. Who can know it.'

b. Polish-Russian ML

у^RU меня^RU есть^RU pomysł. Как^RU я^RU pojadę na Украину^RU pójdę na университет^RU i zapytam czy они^RU chocią^RU/PL это^RU. Jak да^RU, to spoko. Jak нет^RU тоже^RU spoko.

'I've got an idea. When I go to Ukraine, I'll visit the university and ask if they want this. If yes, then OK. If not, also OK.'

In some instances, however, the compartmentalization can be neater – two source languages contribute to the different parts of the resultant system. This is especially typical of languages that are typologically distant, e.g. English and Lingala, as well as English and Mandinka. As illustrated by an excerpt from the English-Lingala ML in (3), in such cases, one language (English) tends to contribute to the grammatical structure – especially, that of verbal phrases – anchors predication and determines

---

3 Even though various Polish and Russian lexemes are differentiated graphically, their pronunciation is identical or highly similar in both languages, e.g. *u – y* 'at, by', *jest – есть* 'is', *ja – я* 'I', *uniwersytet – университет* 'university'. The form *chocią* is hybridized. It mainly reflects the 3pl. *chcą* 'they want' in Polish. However, the vowel *o* found in the root, is donated by *хотеть* 'want' / *хотят* 'they want' in Russian.

word order, while the other language (Lingala) principally donates the lexicon, mostly its content part as well as, although less exclusively, elements of the noun phrase.[4]

(3)   English-Lingala ML

Lelo[LG] ngai[LG] will mpenza[LG] kosala[LG] sala[LG]. Ngai[LG] have koloba[LG] with the HoD and yo[LG] is fine with oyo[LG] – ngai[LG] will kozala[LG] [na ndako na nagi] [LG]

'Today I will only work. I have spoken with the HoD and she is fine with this – I will be (i.e. stay) at home.'

Some discourses attest to another type of neat compartmentalization found in mixed languages – relexification (cf. Matras 2009: 246; Meakins 2013: 193; Velupillai 2015: 83). Accordingly, the lexemes of one language are inserted in their original phonological shape in the grammatical frame of the other language. In other words, lexemes from the language *a* are superimposed onto the structure of the hosting language *b*. This leads to an orderly demarcation of the source languages: one language (a) donates vocabulary, the other language (b) donates structure. In (4), the entire vocabulary – nouns, verbs, pronouns, conjunctions, response words – are provided by Mandinka. However, the structure of the grammar reflects English. This may be visible in the position of objects (cf. *kanu a* 'love it', *suula buŋo* 'need a house', *ñininka nte* 'ask me', and *lafita buŋo* 'want a house' in (4), instead of *a kanu*, *buŋo suula*, *nte ñininka*, and *buŋo lafita* in Mandinka); the use of the demonstrative only before the noun (in Mandinka, the postnominal position is also grammatical); and the use of independent pronouns instead of pronominal markers in certain tenses (compare *nte kanu a* 'I love it' and *nte lafita buŋo* 'I want the house' in (4) with *ŋa kanu* and *n lafita buŋo la* in Mandinka).

(4)   English-Mandinka ML

Ñiŋ buŋo beteyaata. Nte kanu a. A beteyaata. Nte hanii suula doo buŋo. Niŋ itolu ñininka nte niŋ nte lafita doo buŋo, nte be fo: hanii

'This house (is) good. I love it. It (is) good. I don't need another house. If they ask me if I want another house, I will say: no!'

As is typical of mixed languages in general (cf. Matras 2009: 288, 305; Meakins 2013; Velupillai 2015; Meakins et al. 2019), the mixed languages developed by Сашко do not involve impoverishing phenomena. They do not constitute simplified versions of their respective sources. Instead, they either preserve the complexity of the source languages or, more commonly, increase the source complexities even further. Overall, the set of rules describing any given mixed language of Сашко is greater than the set of rules describing each of the contributing languages separately. This increase in complexity is visible with regards to both a distinctiveness criterion and an economy

---

4   Even though Сашко's mixed languages formed via the fusional route tend to, at least originally, compartmentalize the grammatical and lexical material more neatly, this compartmentalization gradually becomes less tidy and less controlled as the usage persists.

criterion – two of the main criteria employed in measuring complexity in linguistics (Miestamo 2006, 2008; Parkvall 2008; Sinnemäki 2008, 2009, 2011). Regarding the distinctiveness criterion, Сашко's mixed languages attest to more overt categorial distinctions (e.g. domains, meanings, functions) than their source languages. Regarding the economy criterion, Сашко's mixed languages exhibit more manners of expression of a given categorial distinction than their sources – there are more forms or structures available to express a given domain, concept, or function. Indeed, all mixed languages developed by Сашко are characterized by synonymy, redundancy, allomorphy, free variations, and the nearly pedantic maintenance of broadly understood exceptions – phenomena that typically increase complexity in languages (McWhorter 2007, 2008; Hammarström 2008: 29).

The enrichment in terms of greater distinctiveness and lesser economy primarily results from the concurrent incorporation of the complexities of the two respective source languages. The verbal system of the Polish-French ML will illustrate this. With regard to the distinctiveness criterion, the Polish-French ML distinguishes a significantly larger set of verbal categories than its two source languages. All verbal categories typical of Polish and French are present in that mixed variety, e.g. perfective and imperfective, subjunctive and conditional, person, number, and gender inflections, as well as all types of participles and gerunds. In other words, the two source systems are activated in the novel system. With regards to the economy principle, the French-Polish ML also offers more manners to express each category than is the case of each of its sources. For example, two words exist for a number of semantic concepts or domains (e.g. *ami* and *przyjaciel* 'friend') or two constructions (analytical or synthetic) may coexist to express a given function or category (e.g. *j'ai écrit* and *j'ai napisać* 'I wrote/have written'). Furthermore, irregular patterns of the source languages (e.g. inflections typical of specific verbs in French) are not replaced by the regular ones. Rather, all the patterns are preserved and combined. Such complexification is evident not only in the verbal system – it characterizes any language level, whether content vocabulary, function words, morphology, syntax, or word order.

The enrichment may also stem from novelties – or features developed in a mixed language that are absent in the source languages. These novelties may be of three types. First, some novelties are hybridized forms elaborated by merging elements present in the sources in an original manner. In the content lexicon, these hybridizations can be illustrated by bilingual compounds often used alongside forms inherited from the source languages, e.g. *hund(ur)*[IC]-*perro*[SP] or *piesek*[PL]-*perro*[SP] 'dog', *hi*[EN]-*hola*[SP] 'hello', *carro*[SP]-*bíll*[IC] 'car'; or more fused forms: *forkowiec* 'fork' (*fork*[EN] + *wi(del)ec*[PL]), *autochód* (*auto*[EN] + *(samo)chód*[PL]), *erovél* (*airplane*[EN] + *flugvél*[IC]). Hybridized forms are also found in morphology where some novel suffixes have resulted from the combination of the suffixes found in the two source languages: the 1sg. ending *-mo* in the Spanish-Polish mixed language, e.g. *chce-mo* (*ę*[PL] (pronounced *em*) + *o*[SP] > *mo*); the nominative feminine ending *-an* in the Icelandic-Polish mixed language, e.g. *kobiet-an* '(a/the) woman' (*a*[PL] + *an*[IC] > *an*); or the suffix *-ski* used in adjectives indicating origin in the Icelandic-Polish mixed language, e.g. *pólski, þýski, svenski*

(*sk-(ur)*[IC] + *ski*[PL] > *ski*). The second type of novelties contains categories that are absent in the source languages. However, due to their cross-linguistic pervasiveness, they have been developed through analogies to other languages by using material present in the source systems (e.g. the progressive aspect *je suis parlący* 'I am talking' and the present perfect *j'ai napisać/napisané* 'I have written' in the verbal system of the Polish-French ML). The third type includes innovations that do not draw, even formally, on the source languages but instead exploit more creative, often ideophonic and onomatopoeic manners of words' coinage, e.g. *fuchufuchu* 'have sex', *gluglu* 'drink', and *frufru* 'do' (also used as a general verbal replacement), *ponyoponyo* and *piupiu* 'small', and *pyrpyr* 'motor; motorbike' (in Spanish-Icelandic and a number of English-based mixed languages).

   To conclude this section, the mixed-language framework adopted in this paper (cf. especially Meakins 2013; as well as Matras 2000, 2009; Thomason 2001; Field 2002; Velupillai 2015) enables me to view all discourses produced by Сашко in a more unitary manner. Rather than seeing code-switching/borrowing and language mixing as essentially different phenomena, the three can be understood as stages along a diachronic and/or conceptual continuum. This continuum schematizes the process whereby an unsystematic, unbalanced, and/or unstable language interaction surfacing in the mechanisms of code-switching and borrowing transmutes into a systematic, balanced, and stable language interaction that surfaces in a new language-contact type – a mixed language. This process is gradual. There are no clear boundaries separating the categorial prototypes of code-switching, borrowing, and language mixing. Rather, one deals with large transition phrases in which features characteristic of the prototypes of contact mechanisms and language-contact types distinguished are intermingled to a greater or lesser extent. As mentioned at the beginning of this section, given the unidirectional formation of the vast majority of Сашко's mixed languages, such gradual progressions from code-switching and borrowing to a mixed language occurred each time where Сашко migrated from one place of residence to another. It should however be noted that Сашко's mixed languages are less prototypical from a socio-linguistic perspective as their "population" includes two persons: Сашко and his interlocutor, who often only acts as a passive recipient of the mixed language. Therefore, the process of entrenchment operates differently from the entrenchment taking place in prototypical mixed languages involving large population groups.

3. A holistic perspective on Сашко-lect – translanguaging

Сашко-lect – or the language of Сашко in its totality – cannot be adequately comprehended by limiting the analysis to the examination of mechanisms of code-switching and borrowing that are present in individual discourses, or to the study of mixed languages that emerge due to the more systematic and entrenched use of code-switching and the more intense and well-balanced borrowing. The former fragmentizes Сашко-lect into a myriad of code-switching instantiations and

gives prominence to the external named languages rather than the idiolectal systems specific to Сашко. The latter does understand the blends as autonomous and Сашко-specific systems, qualitatively distinct from their source languages, but again fragmentizes the language of Сашко into a number of disengaged entities. Even though Сашко-lect certainly draws on grammatical and lexical devices recognizable through the switching, borrowing, and mixing of codes, it is not limited to those phenomena – it transcends them greatly. In my view, holistic grammars of multilingual individuals – which transcend code-switching, borrowing, and code-mixing – are better dealt with in the framework of translanguaging (cf. García 2009; Zhu, Li, Lyons 2017; Mazzaferro 2018: 5).

First, Сашко-lect exhibits three socio-historical or socio-economic properties that distinguish it from other types of languages and contact varieties:

- Contrary to code-switching, borrowing, and, to an extent, mixed-languages, named languages do not constitute the essence of Сашко-lect or its *raison d'être*. The essence of Сашко-lect is, as predicated by translanguaging theory (cf. Mazzaferro 2018: 3; Sabino 2018: 48) Сашко's idiolect itself in which, and for which, the single person, Сашко, constitutes the main focus. The perspective is thus individualistic and speaker-centred rather than communitarian and language-centred.
- Contrary to most types of code-switching, borrowing, and mixed-languages, Сашко-lect is the language that has been emerging in the context of extreme multilingualism and extreme mobility – as is characteristic of translanguaging individuals (cf. García 2009; Pennycook 2016: 212; Mazzaferro 2018: 7) – rather than bilingualism and unidirectional migration. It is not two, three, or four languages that interact – the total number of named languages involved ascends to forty. For Сашко, radical multilingualism and radical transnational mobility constitute a pervasive routine. In contrast, monolingualism and/or cultural stasis – or even bilingualism – are practically unknown, even if only on a daily basis.
- Because of Сашко's social position, types of jobs held, and activities carried out throughout his life, his multilingual discourses and, as result, Сашко-lect itself are, at least in certain spaces, only minimally obstructed by named languages and artificial language-boundaries. Although in various situations Сашко must act according to the named language's rules, in many others, he may transgress them, and this transgression does not result in ostracism or social condemnation.

Second, from a linguistic perspective, contrary to a superficial fragmentation into different external languages (if analyzed in terms of code-switching or borrowing) or into different internal languages (if analyzed in terms of mixed languages) – but in harmony with translanguaging (cf. García 2009; Canagarajah 2011: 1; García, Flores 2012: 239; García, Li 2014: 43; Zhu, Li, Lyons 2017; Mazzaferro 2018: 3, 5; Sabino 2018: 34, 36) – Сашко-lect is unitary. It does not consist of activating autonomous and disengaged language systems, or individual and separated linguistic skills. It rather involves an integrated orchestration of multilingual resources that, depending on

the lens chosen, surface as code-switching, borrowing, and mixing. There is only one true language – Сашко's translanguaged mental grammar. Even though complex and heterogenous, this grammar is patterned and cohesive, being organized around four main principles, namely deliberation, elaborateness, boldness, and emergence:

- Contrary to many types of language change, the construction of the various facets or incarnations of Сашко-lect is deliberated. A conscious manipulation of linguistic resources available to Сашко constitutes the key phenomenon in merging, imitating, deconstructing, and recombining grammatical and lexical material.
- The manipulation is not only deliberate, it is also purposefully geared towards an almost ostentatious elaborateness, be it in terms of domains, categories, rules, words, constructions, expressions, or morpho-syntactic variants. Economy is abandoned for the sake of specificity. Сашко's grammar constantly aims to increase the number of categorial distinctions and the manners of their expressions. When conveying a message, Сашко draws on his entire linguistic knowledge. Looking at reality through the lens provided by all named languages known and having simultaneous access to a myriad of domains and categories provided by those languages jointly, Сашко seeks to activate the highest number of them in his linguistic production.
- The two rules that govern Сашко's mental grammar explained above – i.e. the pursuit of increasing elaborateness and the deliberate manipulation through which this takes place – operate by following another principle, that of boldness. Accordingly, when manipulating linguistic resources, preference is given to extravagance: modifications that transgress the conventional rules more vehemently are preferred over modifications that are less disruptive. The more outrageous the changes introduced by Сашко are from the perspective of normative grammars, the more advantageous and satisfactory they are in his opinion.
- The outcome of this conscious and bold creativity aspires to be – and often is – emergent and nonlinear, instead of constituting a mere resultant and additive composition of individual linguistic skills contained in named languages. That is, modifications performed at a micro-level in specific discourses or at a macro-level in mixed languages, are intended to yield qualitative novelties – exotic innovations absent in named languages on which they (i.e. such modifications) draw. At a micro-level, modification cannot often be directly traced to the feeding systems but exploit the entire linguistic knowledge held by Сашко. At a macro-level, the entire system of Сашко-lect cannot be equated with the pluralization of monolingual idiolects or a collection of independent monolingual abilities. Through creativity, ingenuity, and imagination, Сашко goes beyond adding material inherited from external languages.

Third, as is typical of translanguaging in general (cf. Li 2011; García, Li 2014; Mazzaferro 2018), an essential feature of Сашко-lect is its ideological orientation. Ideology plays a significantly lesser role in code-switching and borrowing. It is more patent in mixed languages. However, while mixed languages are typically developed as markers of new or ancestral/endangered identity, Сашко-lect has, at its global

level, been crafted and reshaped to manifest the constant ideology of Сашко, be it linguistic or socio-cultural. As can be inferred from the recordings in which Сашко comments on his language choices, this unchanged ideology is organized around two main philosophies: on the one hand, it problematizes, or even combats received group wisdoms; on the other hand, it centres and promotes individual freedom.[5]

- Сашко-lect epitomizes the resistance of an individual to the oppressive ideologies of standard language norms, elitist and puritan language academies, parallel additive bilingualisms – or discretely compartmentalized monolingualisms whereby named languages are kept separated and activated in strictly designated contexts and spaces – as well as selective multilingualisms in which politically or economically powerful, colonial, northern languages (e.g. English, French, Spanish, and German) are viewed as advantageous while politically or economically weaker, colonized, southern languages (e.g. Lingala, Mandinka, Xhosa, and Arabic) are viewed as irrelevant, if not disadvantageous. Сашко understands his Сашко-lect as a permanent act of resistance against nation-states, and (state or ethnic) nationalisms – including colonialism – and mono-culturalisms that such nationalistic philosophies produce, as well as their extensions to equally exclusionary and claustrophobic ideas of pan-ethnicism (e.g. pan-Slavism, pan-Scandinavism, pan-Arabism, pan-Africanism) (cf. Li 2011: 1223; García, Li 2014: 43; Mazzaferro 2018: 3, 6;). Since his early adolescence, Сашко-lect has enabled Сашко to mark his rebellious and defiant identity and to disrupt, even though minimally, the current linguistic and socio-cultural *status quo* where the – perhaps inevitably – translanguaged and transcultured individual is oppressed by monolingual and monocultural communities. It is an act of defiance against the hegemony of religious and secular masses, against democracy understood as tyranny of the majority, and against socio-cultural chains imposed by communities and countries.

- The ideology of Сашко-lect is not only negative and destructive – it is also creative and positive. It offers a means of liberation – a typical feature in translanguaging (cf. García, Li 2014: 42; Mazzaferro 2018: 4). It vindicates the agency of a linguistically conscious individual through a deliberate formation of his own language, unrestricted by external factors but constrained only by that individual's creative limits. Through Сашко-lect, Сашко becomes a powerful actor – perhaps the most powerful one – in his own linguistic ecosystem. Through talking, writing, tagging, and naming, Сашко-lect enables Сашко to create his own, individual-centred spaces – his own universe or Сашко-verse. As he rejects countries with their artificial borders and citizenships, he creates his own country and citizenship in every space where Сашко-lect is activated. There, he claims and regains, even if temporary and to a minimal extent, his independence and freedom.

---

[5] The language of the following discussion is more emotionally charged because it draws on Сашко's reflexive recordings. In these recordings, Сашко comments on how he *feels* about his approach to language and *passionately* discusses the ideologies and philosophies that underlie his language choices.

This freedom, however, comes at a high price. Сашко-lect, which is the source of Сашко's linguistic independence, and the multilingualism upon which this independence is based, both constitute the very reason for Сашко's linguistic and cultural homelessness. Сашко feels at home in every country he has lived in and confidently uses most languages he has acquired. He has certainly learned, perhaps even perfectly, how to operate in different linguistic contexts and different cultural settings. He may seem ours in France, Gambia, Germany, Iceland, Poland, South Africa, Spain, or Sweden. Indeed, wherever he goes, he acclimatizes rapidly and successfully, and lacks any feeling of homesickness or nostalgia for a "named" home country. This outstanding ability to navigate between the named, artificially compartmentalized languages and the perfect adaptation to named cultures are nevertheless deceptive. Truly his is only Сашко-lect and the spaces in which it is deployed. No country is his country, and no (named) language is his language. He is an eternal outsider – unattached to any country and any language.

~

After profound reflection, Сашко concludes. His true identity is the road itself: transversing from one country to another, from one culture to another, and from one language to another. For a nomad like himself, the journey is the essence rather than a particular place treated in isolation. Places only gain meaning if they are understood dynamically as stages of a trajectory. For Сашко, individual named languages he knows, particular switches and borrowings in which he exploits them, as well as mixed languages he develops are meaningful and significant if understood in the frame of incessant emergence. Сашко-lect never is – it always becomes. It is an unceasing process of language (re)creation.

"Сашко, how many languages do you speak?" – I ask, at the end. "I only speak my own private Сашко-lect" – he replies and adds: "I speak my road. I truly speak only when I leave, see the shore fading and new islands emerging – and then I arrive." He becomes quiet. After a while he murmurs: "Being in place is just surviving – being in motion is existing."

4. Conclusion

This study examined the idiolect of the hyper-multilingual global nomad, Сашко, as documented in the corpus of notes that span the last twenty-five years of his life. First, I analyzed grammatical and lexical features characterizing Сашко's discourses, visible in the form of code-switching and borrowing. Subsequently, I studied more stable and balanced language interactions in the form of mixed languages. Lastly, I addressed the higher-level components of Сашко's grammar – the translanguaged Сашко-lect. I demonstrated that, when approached holistically, Сашко-lect exhibits a number of distinctive and stable features. Sociohistorically, it draws on individualism, disproportionate diversity and mobility, and a robust economic and

educational position. Linguistically, instead of being a passive additive pluralization of separated, autonomous, and static monolects, it is a deeply orchestrated and coherent system characterized by the principles of deliberation, elaborateness, boldness, and emergence. Ideologically, it provides tools to revolt against the received oppressive communal epistemes of mono-culturalisms, compartmented multilingualisms, and nationalisms, enabling the individual to (re-)construct his freedom. This freedom, however, is ultimately responsible for Сашко's linguistic and cultural homelessness.

Overall, the present study demonstrates the usefulness of a translanguaging approach to multilingualism. In my view, translanguaging offers a higher-level perspective on an idiolect. It expands beyond the language-contact mechanisms of switching and borrowing, as well as beyond the contact language types such as mixed languages. It provides us with more unitary and person-centred treatment of a multilingual person's grammar, focusing on global regularities and principles – not only linguistic ones, but also sociohistorical and ideological ones. In my view to adequately describe and understand Сашко's – or other hyper-multilinguals' – grammar, we need to take into account the three levels of analysis, gradually extending the scopes from atomistic (code-switching and borrowing) to global (the translanguaged grammar), through intermediate (mixed languages). During that methodological process, translanguaging enables us to discover the logic underlying apparently erratic and/or disconnected language switches, borrowings, and mixes.

Lastly, the results of this study suggest that hyper-multilingualism may potentially have destabilizing effects on state-related institutions by questioning their roles and control over people's lives. Hyper-multilingualism not only weakens – or even eliminates – the attachment to a particular language (or languages), it also significantly reduces the attachment to any culture, nation, or state. At least in the case of Сашко, hyper-multilingualism drives the speaker to an open rejection of a concrete cultural, national, or state identity in favour of a "transnationalism", "multi-state-ism", and "trans-country-ism" – a global individualism. This global individualism resulting from hyper-multilingualism may have destabilizing effects on states and state-related institutions. States are corporations. Like corporations, they are inherently oppressive. They tolerate minorities and ideological deviations not because they like it, but because, at least in some parts of the world, they have no other option – minorities being too powerful. However, just as corporations would like to reign through monopoly, states would like to reign over monolingual, monocultural, and monoethnic populations – populations that are fully synchronized with the state's own ideology. Therefore, from the perspective of a state monolith, any linguistic, cultural, and ethnic minority constitutes an undesirable threatening element. The threat brought by a hyper-multilingual, multicultural, multiethnic, and multistate individual is superb. Simply put, if all of us were linguistic and cultural nomads like Сашко, no state borders and institutions would make sense – states would be redundant phenomena.

This raises the question: is this threat to states a threat in a larger sense? Because of translanguaged multilingualism, multiculturalism, and nomadism, most individuals

of future generations may indeed be translanguaged multilingual third culture kids. This could effectively eradicate states and their oppressive ideologies. There will be no need for France, Gambia, Germany, Iceland, Poland, South Africa, Spain, and Sweden – and these will disappear. The world will definitely be different – but it won't be poorer or worse off. New linguistic and cultural features will be developed. And more importantly, at least in some regards, because of its state-less character, this world may be freer and more just.

Abbreviations

EN – English; FR – French; IC – Icelandic; LG – Lingala; ML – mixed language; PL – Polish; RU – Russian; SP – Spanish; TAM – tense/aspect/mood

References

Bakker P. 1997. *A language of our own. The genesis of Michif – the mixed Cree-French language of the Canadian Metis.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Bakker P. 2000. Convergence intertwining: An alternative way towards the genesis of mixed languages. – Gilbers D,. Nerbonne J., Schaeken J. (eds.). *Languages in contact*. Amsterdam: Rodopi: 29–35.

Bakker P. 2003. Mixed languages as autonomous systems. – Matras Y., Bakker P. (eds.). *The mixed language debate. Theoretical and empirical advances*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter: 107–150.

Bakker P., Muysken P. 1995. Mixed languages and language intertwining. – Arends J., Muysken P., Smith N. (eds.). *Pidgins and creoles. An introduction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins: 41–52.

Canagarajah S. 2011. Translanguaging in the classroom: Emerging issues for research and pedagogy. – *Applied Linguistics Review* 2.1: 1–28.

Field F.W. 2002. Linguistic borrowing in bilingual contexts. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

García O. 2009. *Bilingual education in the 21st century.* West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.

García O., Flores N. 2012. Multilingual pedagogies. – Martin-Jones M., Blackledge A., Creese A. (eds.). *The Routledge handbook of multilingualism*. London: Routledge: 232–246.

García O., Li W. 2014. *Translaguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

Hammarström H. 2008. Complexity in numeral systems with an investigation into pidgins and creoles. – Miestamo M., Sinnemäki K., Karlsson F. (eds.). *Language complexity: Typology, contact, change*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins: 287–304.

Li W. 2011. Moment analysis and translanguaging space: Discursive construction of identities by multilingual Chinese youth in Britain. – *Journal of Pragmatics* 43.5: 1222–1235.

Matras Y. 2000. Mixed languages: A functional-communicative approach. – *Bilingualism, Language and Cognition* 3.2: 79–99.

Matras Y. 2003. Mixed languages: Re-examining the structural prototype. – Matras Y., Bakker P. (eds.). *The mixed language debate. Theoretical and empirical advances*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter: 151–175.

Matras Y. 2009. *Language contact*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mazzaferro G. 2018. Translanguaging as everyday practice. An introduction. – Mazzaferro G. (eds.). *Translanguaging as everyday practice*. Cham: Springer: 1–12.

McWhorter J. 2007. *Language interrupted: Signs of non-native acquisition in standard language grammars*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

McWhorter J. 2008. Why does a language undress? Strange cases in Indonesia. – Miestamo M., Sinnemäki K., Karlsson F. (eds.). *Language complexity: Typology, contact, change*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins: 167–190.

Meakins F. 2013. Mixed languages. – Bakker P., Matras Y. (eds.). *Contact languages: A comprehensive guide*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter: 159–228.

Meakins F., Hua X., Algy C., Bromham L. 2019. Birth of a contact language did not favor simplification. – Language 95.2: 294–332.

Miestamo M. 2006. On the complexity of standard negation. – Suominen M., Arppe A., Airola A., Heinämäki O., Miestamo M., Määttä U., Niemi J., Pitkänen K., Sinnemäki K. (eds.). *A man of measure: Festschrift in honour of Fred Karlsson on his 60th birthday*. Turku: The Linguistic Association of Finland: 345–356.

Miestamo M. 2008. Grammatical complexity in a cross-linguistic perspective. – Miestamo M., Sinnemäki K., Karlsson F. (eds.). *Language complexity: Typology, contact, change*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins: 23–41.

Muysken P. 2000. *Bilingual speech. A typology of code-mixing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Parkvall M. 2008. The simplicity of creoles in a cross-linguistic perspective. – Miestamo M. Sinnemäki K., Karlsson F. (eds.). *Language complexity: Typology, contact, change*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins: 265–285.

Pennycook A. 2016. Mobile times, mobile terms: The trans-super-poly-metro movement. – Coupland N. (ed.). *Sociolinguistics: Theoretical debates*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 201–216.

Sabino R. 2018. *Languaging without languages: Beyond metro-, multi-, poly-, pluri- and translanguaging*. Leiden: Brill.

Sinnemäki K. 2008. Complexity trade-offs in core argument marking. – Miestamo M., Sinnemäki K., Karlsson F. (eds.). *Language complexity: Typology, contact, change*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins: 67–88.

Sinnemäki K. 2009. Complexity in core argument marking and population size. – Sampson G., Gil D., Trudgill P. (eds.). *Language complexity as an evolving variable*. Oxford: Oxford University Press: 126–140.

Sinnemäki K. 2011. *Language universals and linguistic complexity: Three case studies in core argument marking*. [PhD Diss., University of Helsinki].

Thomason S.G. 2001. *Language contact. An introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Velupillai V. 2015. *Pidgins, creoles and mixed languages. An introduction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Zhu H., Li W., Lyons A. 2017. Polish shop(ping) as translanguaging space. – *Social Semiotics* 27.4: 411–433.