ENGLISH-ORIGIN DISCOURSE MARKERS IN NEW ZEALAND SERBIAN[1]

Ksenija Mincic Obradovic: *Speech Science, University of Auckland*
<k.obradovic@auckland.ac.nz>

Abstract

Starting from the premise that discourse markers are particularly prone to borrowing in a bilingual setting, this study examines English-origin sequentiality and identity markers in New Zealand Serbian. Data was collected in the 2004–2011 period and comes from e-mails, mobile and Skype messages exchanged between 37 bilinguals, born in Serbia, who have lived in New Zealand for ten to twenty years. English sequentiality markers (e.g. *anyway*, *so*) are found rarely, and in place of their Serbian equivalents, indicating that Serbian is still the pragmatically dominant language, and that the sporadic choice of English over Serbian forms is not conscious. By contrast, English greetings and politeness markers (such as *love*, *kiss*, and *please*) are often used as identity markers, deliberately, and with the intention of adding a layer of social meaning. The difference between these two types of markers confirms that multiple motivations and constraints need to be considered when analysing contact-induced change.

1. Introduction

A number of studies on languages in contact claim that discourse markers are at the very top of the borrowability hierarchy (see for example Maschler, 2000b; Matras, 1998, 2000; Matras & Sakel, 2007; Salmons, 1990; Sankoff et al., 1997). Myers-Scotton (2006) argues that discourse markers are probably the most common core borrowings, which is, according to Matras (2009), particularly true in the immigrant setting.

This paper discusses the borrowing of English-origin discourse markers by first generation Serbians in New Zealand. The Serbian Community in New Zealand is relatively new and small. As expected in an early immigrant situation, the Matrix language is Serbian with embedded English islands (Myers-Scotton, 1993) which are predominantly single-lexeme inserts.

In the New Zealand Serbian noticeable is difference in how different English-origin markers are treated. While there are only five occurrences of English-origin discourse markers connecting units of discourse, several English greetings and politeness markers are used frequently and systematically as markers of social identity (Matras, 2009). This study examines these two types of English-origin markers — which lexical items are used and why there are treated so differently in New Zealand Serbian. The study indicates that multiple aspects of language contact need to be taken into consideration when analysing possible motivations and constraints on borrowing.

2. Definition of discourse markers

Linguists have used various terms for discourse markers in the literature. According to Fraser (1999) there are as many as fifteen of them including *discourse markers, pragmatic markers, discourse particles,* and *discourse connectives*. Terminological disagreements among researchers revolve around definitions of *discourse* vs. *pragmatic* as well as *marker* vs. *particle* vs. *connective.* The debates reflect different approaches towards the functions that discourse markers have, and word classes that can be used as discourse markers.

Maschler (2009), for example, stresses the metalinguistic function as the main and unique role of discourse markers and says that discourse markers may refer to the text (commenting on it, but not modifying *specific* constituents within the utterance), to interpersonal relationships between the interlocutors, or to cognitive processes involved in utterance interpretation.

Schiffrin (1987) defines discourse markers as sequentially dependent elements that bracket units of discourse. She suggests that they can be comprised of members of various word classes (including conjunctions and adverbs as well as lexicalised phrases). She proposes a model of different discourse planes and concludes that markers can function at different levels of discourse to connect utterances on either a single plane, or across different planes.

Fraser (1999) thinks of the discourse marker as a type of lexical expression

drawn primarily from the syntactic classes of conjunctions, adverbs and prepositional phrases, which signals relationships between the segments it introduces and prior segments. He regards discourse markers as a type of commentary pragmatic marker. He recognises three classes of pragmatic markers (1990) — *basic markers* (such as *please*) which indicate with what force the speaker intends the message to be taken, *commentary markers* (such as *frankly*) which comment on the basic message and *parallel markers* (such as *damn*) which signal a message in addition to the basic message. According to him, commentary markers are members of a separate syntactic category which carry pragmatic rather than content meaning, and discourse markers signal the relationship of the basic message to the foregoing discourse.

Since the terms *discourse* and *pragmatic marker* are largely interchangeable (Huang, 2012), I will use the term *discourse marker* as a convenient cover term, for the purposes of this article. This enables the inclusion, under a single conceptual umbrella (Jucker & Ziv, 1998), of a broad variety of discourse operators which, as Matras (1998, 2009) notes, have two common characteristics — they are responsible for monitoring and directing the processing of propositional content in conversation, and they are particularly prone to borrowing in a bilingual setting.

3. Discourse marker borrowing

The general opinion is that discourse markers are easily transferred from one language to another because they do not need to be integrated into the grammatical system of the borrowing language. As extra-clausal forms (Matras, 2000), their function is discourse-specific and subject to minimal syntactic restrictions.

Linguists studying discourse markers do not always agree on the motivations for discourse marker borrowings.

Maschler takes a functional interactional linguistics perspective (1994, 1997, 2000a, 2000b, 2009) and proposes that markers are switched, not despite, but because, they belong to a different language. Her analysis is based on the strategic exploitation of the contrast between the two systems and she points out that the motivation for switching between languages at discourse markers may be strategic.

Like Maschler, Schiffrin (2003) takes a more interactional perspective in analysing these examples of loans. She sees discourse markers not only as

units of language, but as arising from processes of social interactivity, and says that it is ultimately the properties of the discourse itself (such as the speaker's goal, the social situation, and so on) that provide the need for the marker to appear. This is in contrast to Matras (2000) who argues that the cognitive motivation to reduce mental effort is so strong that at times it overrides social and communicative constraints and leads to unintentional choices and slips.

Matras proposes a principle of pragmatic detachability (Matras, 1998) and argues that the pragmatic role of discourse markers as highly automatic conversational routines, makes it difficult for speakers to maintain control and monitor the boundaries between different linguistic repertoires and that this leads to selection errors (Matras, 2009). Following Matras (1998), Matras and Sakel (2007) argue that borrowing is motivated by cognitive pressure on the speaker to reduce the mental processing load because the act of borrowing allows the structural manifestation of certain mental processing operations in the two languages to merge.

4. Serbian people and their language in New Zealand

The majority of Serbians in New Zealand immigrated during and immediately after the Yugoslav wars of 1991 to 1995. Data in Table 1, which contains figures by birth and ethnicity from the 2006 Census (Statistics New Zealand, 2007), shows that there are just over 1,000 Serbians living in New Zealand.

Table 1: Number of Serbians living in New Zealand according to the 2006 New Zealand Population Census

2006 NEW ZEALAND POPULATION CENSUS	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
No. of people born in Serbia and Montenegro[2]	582	585	1,173
No. of people of Serbian ethnicity	489	540	1,029

Language attitudes and identity play an important role in the maintenance of minority languages. As Thomason notes,

> "the reason contact-induced change is unpredictable, is that speakers are unpredictable." (Thomason, 2001, p. 85)

There is good evidence that Serbians in New Zealand strive to maintain their native language. Gerzić (2001) surveyed 21 New Zealand permanent residents who came to New Zealand after 1991 and whose mother tongue was Serbo-Croatian, some coming from Serbia and some from Croatia, and found that these new immigrants placed much value on preserving their Serbian and Croatian culture and language. Similarly, Doucet (1991), who studied first generation Serbo-Croatian speakers in Queensland, Australia, notes that both Serbians and Croatians

> "regard language maintenance as vital to religious and ideological continuity, and strive to maintain their language" (Doucet, 1991, p. 283).

My own experience agrees with Gerzic's and Doucet's findings — new immigrants see the Serbian language as an important part of their culture and identity. Proof for this comes from informal interviews as well as from the fact that, soon after their arrival, Serbian immigrants started an informal Serbian language school and established a culture centre, a drama club, a choir, and a church.

Contacts with Serbia remain strong and so does exposure to the Serbian language. Modern modes of communication enable new immigrants to stay in close touch with family and friends back in Serbia. Serbian newspapers are readily available on the Internet, as well as free e-books, television programmes and movies. Auckland Libraries have a small collection of books in Serbian. There is also a Serbian satellite television channel. All of these factors create a positive predisposition towards Serbian language maintenance.

Uncertainty about the future has been a strong motivation for maintaining native language. Emigration to New Zealand was triggered by the war in former Yugoslavia, and although some Serbians wanted to stay, others planned to spend a few years in New Zealand and then move to another country (closer to ageing parents) or to return to Serbia when living conditions improved. Twenty years later, many have already left New Zealand.[3]

However, it remains an open question whether the above precludes any incursions from English into the Serbian of these speakers. Even in Europe, the Standard Serbian language is regarded as being very open to borrowings from other languages. Ivan Klajn observes that borrowings are common in Serbian and says that

> "Ever since the beginnings of its standardization in the nineteenth century, the language of Serbia has been extremely open to foreign influence. Purism has always been weak and inefficient" (Klajn, 2001, p. 90).

This larger sociolinguistic openness to incorporating elements from other languages means that, despite Serbian speakers in New Zealand being well disposed to maintain their language, it might be that the 'social baggage' associated with the language itself means they are unlikely to be strictly policing or stigmatising English borrowings.

5. NZSEMC corpus and participants

The NZSEMC (New Zealand Serbian Electronically-Mediated Communication) corpus is based on the language of 37 new Serbian immigrants (one of them being myself). Data was collected in the 2004–2011 period and comes from Electronically-Mediated Communication (Baron, 2008) — emails, SMS (Short Message Service) messages exchanged via mobile phones, and IM (Instant Messages) exchanged via Skype.

One contentious issue is whether the language of Electronically-Mediated Communication (EMC) should be considered to be written verbal communication or writing. EMC has many characteristics of spoken language, including that messages are more loosely structured, and are composed using simpler syntax. Baron (1998) uses the term 'speech by other means'. Crystal (2001) introduced term "Netspeak", but points out that 'speak' covers both writing and talking. Herring (2003), on the other hand, argues that EMC language is different from either speaking or writing. Different modes of EMC (e-mails, SMS and IM messages) show differences in their relationship to spoken and written language. SMS mimics the spoken mode more than e-mails (Tagg, 2011), and because IM messages are transmitted in real time, they are even more speech-like than e-mails and text messages. However, as Baron (2008) points out, although they are very speech-like, they are not as close to speech as we tend to assume.

The NZSEMC data consists of 721 email messages, 326 SMS messages and 112 Skype conversations. The majority of the messages come from my own correspondence with participants, while a small number of e-mails were exchanged between my friends and given to me for the purposes of this study.[4]

Based on their relationship to me, the participants are grouped into:

- **Friends** — Seven female and seven male participants I know well, including their backgrounds, and their attitudes towards the Serbian language. Some, but not all, of the people in this group know each

other, and are friends among themselves. I maintain regular contact with them.

- ☐ **Acquaintances** — Seven female and five male participants I do not know as well as the people from the previous category, but sociolinguistic data about them is available to me. I maintain sporadic contact with them.
- ☐ **Strangers** — Four female and six male participants I barely know, and do not maintain contact with.

Topics and frequency of conversation vary from group to group. With "**Friends"** I corresponded often during the period covered by this study, and on a variety of topics, such as family, holiday plans, work and property purchasing. My correspondence with "**Acquaintances"** was less frequent than with "**Friends"**, but includes the same topics. "**Strangers"** contacted me only once or twice (rarely more than this), mostly in order to arrange translations, and my correspondence with them is mainly about this one topic.

All participants were born in Serbia, and came to New Zealand as adults. They have lived in New Zealand for only a relatively short period of time. At the time this eight-year study started, the longest period any of participants had lived in New Zealand was ten years. Most of participants work as professionals or are self-employed.

The majority of participants hold university degrees from Serbia, which means that they should be proficient in using Standard Serbian. Several authors suggest that the type of code-switching utilised seems to be directly proportional to the educational level of bilingual speakers, as well as to age and language proficiency (see for example Bentahila & Davies, 1992; Savić, 1994).

For all participants English is the language used in the broader social and interactional context — at work, in everyday interaction with other New Zealanders, sometimes even with their children. They are all fairly proficient users of English as they have white collar jobs so language skills and the use of English are very much part of their linguistic capital (Bourdieu, 1991).

6. Markers of sequentiality borrowed from English

Based on a fairly extensive cross-varietal study, Matras (2009) argues that the first discourse markers to be borrowed are connectors, and at the top of the

subset hierarchy of connectors are expressions of contrast (but > or > and) and expressions of sequentiality, followed by expressions of justification, reason and consequence.

In the NZSEMC data there are only five examples of English-origin markers that connect units of discourse, or as Schegloff says, "do a piece of sequential work" (Schegloff, 1987, p. 72). These are *anyway*, *by the way* and *so*.

The function of these borrowed discourse markers is the same as in English discourse. In all cases, there are Serbian equivalents and so they cannot be considered to be filling lexical gaps.

Anyway and *by the way,* which Fraser calls topic reorientation markers (Fraser, 2009), are used to signal digression to a new topic, or to emphasise the current topic.

Anyway appears once:

(1) ***Anyway**, jako mi je drago da [...]*

'**Anyway**, I am really glad that […]'

This sentence was taken from an e-mail in which an acquaintance talks about using e-books in academia, and more particularly, problems relating to e-textbooks. Then, he changes the focus of the topic and says that he is glad a book about e-books is getting published, and continues to talk about this future book. This change is marked with *anyway.* He could have used the Serbian expression *u svakom slučaju* ('in any case'), which would be a direct but much longer analogue. He could also have chosen the much shorter Serbian *no* ('however'), which although semantically not equivalent, would have had the same function.

The discourse marker *by the way* is used twice. In example (2) it is at the end of a new unit of discourse while in example (3), it is at the beginning. In both cases it guides attention to a new sub-topic, however, in (2) it adds a bit of information to the present topic (Fraser, 2009) while in (3) it requests additional information about the present topic.

Example (2) comes from a longer e-mail correspondence which starts with a friend inviting me to a party. After I ask if I should contribute with some food, she goes into detailed description of her plans, and finishes off with:

(2) *Biće dosta sveta, **by the way.***

'There will be a lot of people, **by the way**.'

Example (3) is from a longer correspondence in which a friend, who also

works at the University of Auckland, enquires about borrowing material from one of the University of Auckland branch libraries. After I explain the terms of borrowing, he asks:

(3) ***BTW,***[5] *jel' im znaš možda extenziju?*
'**BTW**, do you maybe know their extension number?'

In situations (2) and (3), the appropriate Serbian phrase would be *usput budi rečeno* (the literal translation being 'to be said by the way') or *kad smo kod toga* ('as we are on this [topic]').

The discourse marker *so*, a marker of cause and result (Schiffrin, 1987), occurs only once in the Serbian corpus. Example (4) is an excerpt from SMS correspondence in which my friend (F) and I negotiate the return of borrowed tools:

(4a) me: *Treba da vam vratimo alat.*
'We need to give you back the tools.'

(4b) F: ***So**, ko dolazi, mi ili vi?*
'**So**, who is coming, us or you?'

After I mention that my husband and I need to return the tools we borrowed, my friend (line 4b) concludes that we will have to meet to return the tools, and initiates a move to a slightly different topic, which is to ask where the meeting will happen, at our house, or theirs. Instead of *so*, the Serbian marker *dakle*, which is a direct equivalent, could have been used.

The marker *so* also occurs once within a section of English discourse, where it introduces a conclusion that follows from the previous part of the e-mail message:

(5) *[Moje naselje]*[6] *sve bolje izgleda. Stalno nešto menjaju. Na početku [mog naselja] rade novi* ***medical centre, so that is good as well.***
'[My suburb] is looking better and better. They are making changes all the time. At the beginning of [my suburb], there will be a new **medical centre, so that is good as well**.'

Here, a friend tells me that her suburb keeps changing for the better. She adds that a medical centre has also been built, and then concludes that this (the new medical centre) will add to the quality of life in the area. She uses the English term *medical centre* after which she continues the sentence in English. Here a

switch from one language to the other accompanies the use of the transferred discourse marker (Clyne, 1972).

Examples (2) and (5) are from the same person, in whose e-mails there are many instances of switching between Serbian and English. Examples (1–3) and (5) are from e-mail correspondence and (4) is from a mobile text message. There are, however, not enough examples to relate discourse marker usage to participants' groups, nor to different EMC modes (emails, SMS messages or IM messages). As can be seen from Table 2, all examples are from the second half of the period examined: (5) is from 2008, (3) is from 2009, and the others are from 2011.This indicates that in future years even more discourse markers should be expected to be found in New Zealand Serbian.

Table 2: Distribution of sequential markers over years

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Anyway	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
By the way	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	1
So	—	—	—	—	1[7]	—	—	1

The question that arises is whether the written mode of discourse could be the reason for such a small number of English-origin sequentiality markers in the NZSEMC corpus. There are, however, some counter-arguments. First, discourse markers are linguistic items that function in both spoken and written discourse. Halliday and Hasan's (1976) analysis of cohesion is based primarily on written discourse, while Fraser (1990) notes that certain discourse markers occur more frequently in written discourse while others are found more frequently in conversation. Second, EMC has many characteristics of spoken language. Although we might expect fewer discourse markers in this written corpus than in, for example, Matras' verbal corpora, we might expect to find more discourse markers in e-mails, IM and SMS messages (in that order) than in formal writing. Third, all the discourse markers used to organise units of discourse in the NZSEMC, except the five examples mentioned above, are of Serbian origin, as in (6). In this excerpt from a Skype chat, a friend (F) and I are discussing our holiday plans. She tries to convince me not to go camping in Coromandel. Instead she would like me to go with her to Tolaga Bay:

(6a) F: ***A*** *na Koromandelu ćete biti sami u šumi.*
'**And** you will be alone in the forest in Coromandel.'

(6b) me: ***A*** *u šumi ima vuk.*
'**And** there is a wolf in the forest.'

(6c) F: ***I*** *samoća je depresivna.*
'**And** loneliness is depressive.'

(6d) ***I*** *nema vina iz Tolage.*
'**And** there is no Tolaga wine.'

(6e) me: *Nema vina.*
'No wine.'

(6f) F: ***E pa*** *to je presudno.*
'**Well,** that's crucial.'

(6g) me: *Donećete vi kad dolazite.*
'You will bring [some] when you come [to see us].'

(6h) F: ***A*** *nema ni kajsijevače.*
'**And** there is no apricot brandy.'

(6i) ***Ni*** *kozica.*
'**Nor** goat meat.'

In the above conversation, the function of the Serbian discourse markers is similar to the function of their English equivalents in English discourse (Schiffrin, 2003). Serbian discourse markers *a* ('and') and *i* ('and')[8] occur frequently at the beginning of messages (6a–6d). In (6a), (6b), (6c), and (6h) they are signalling turn-taking. In (6d) and (6i), *i* ('and) and *ni* ('nor') are markers of conceptual organisation (Schiffrin, 2003) and are used here to add additional arguments. The discourse marker *e pa* ('well'), which precedes (6f), marks a conclusion.

Matras, who suggests the concept of a "pragmatically dominant language", i.e. "the language towards which bilinguals directs maximum mental effort at a given instance of linguistic interaction" (Matras, 2000, p. 521), argues that this language is the system which is the target of fusion around discourse markers.

Based on the lack of English, and the presence of Serbian markers, and following Matras, I propose that Serbian is still the pragmatically dominant language among first generation Serbians living in New Zealand and that the selection of an English over a Serbian marker in the above five examples is not intentional, but an "error" in the selection of language. According to Matras, in an unconscious attempt to reduce the mental effort and to simplify monitoring-and-directing operations in a conversation, bilinguals eliminate the language-specific options and automaticise the choice of expressions. This temporary fusion (or non-separation) makes it difficult for bilinguals to maintain control, and monitor the boundaries between different linguistic repertoires which leads to unintentional slippages.

A number of factors contribute to Serbian continuing to be the language in which the first generation of bilinguals are more confident or proficient. Strong contacts with Serbia enable Serbians to refresh their knowledge of their native language, thereby maintaining its dominance within their bilingual repertoire. Also, there is no peer pressure to speak English within the immigrant community, which has often been recognised as a contributing factor to contact-induced change. New Zealand Serbians are largely middle-class people, and valorisation of bilingualism is very much a middle class trait. Probably the most important factor is that most Serbians have been living in New Zealand for a relatively short period of time, only fifteen to twenty years. English-origin sequential markers all appear in second part of the period examined, and three of them in the last year. This confirms that length of contact is an important factor in contact induced change (Thomason & Kaufman, 1988), and suggest a possible change in the pragmatically dominant language at some point in the future.

7. Markers of social identity

Greetings are another discourse-level phenomenon which show considerable volatility in bilingual contexts (Matras, 2009). Looking at *thank you, sorry* and *please* in Cypriot Greek, Terkourafi argues that once these terms are borrowed, they are bleached of their speech-act signalling potential and increasingly come to function as discourse markers. She points out that these developments are known in other bilingual contexts as well, that different communities of practice express locally significant dimensions of variation, and that "borrowed terms serve as in-group identity markers for the members of each community" (Terkourafi, 2011, p. 219).

In NZSEMC, several English greetings and politeness markers are borrowed frequently and systematically. They all have equivalents in Serbian language therefore a lexical gap is not a motivating factor for borrowing. I propose that these borrowings add "a layer of social meaning" (Eckert, 2012) and thus have function of markers of social identity (Matras, 2009). New Zealand Serbians use English greetings and politeness markers when exchanging messages with other members of Serbian community in New Zealand. It appears they send each other message, we are Serbians, but different from other Serbians who are still living in Serbia; we are also New Zealanders, but different from other New Zealanders with whom we do not share the same experiences. As immigrants, we face the same problems, and this has made us a unique group of people, 'special kind of friends'.

There are 87 examples of greetings and markers of politeness borrowed from English, and they comprise 15% of all examples of English-origin borrowings in the NZSEMC corpus. Unlike sequential markers, they are evenly distributed over the whole period covered by the study. Table 3 shows that the use of identity markers correlates strongly with gender, and to which of three groups participants belong.

Table 3: Usage of identity markers by gender and level of acquaintance

	FRIENDS	ACQUAINTANCES	STRANGERS
FEMALE	Love	Hi	Hi
	Kiss	Sorry	
	H&K	Please	
	Thanks		
	Sorry		
	Please		
	Thanks		
MALE	Hi	Hi	Hi
	Sorry	Sorry	
	Please		
	Thanks		

The greetings *Love, Kiss, H&K* at the end of messages appear in informal

settings and among female friends. In many cases, these greetings are the only English forms in the entire message. Here are a few examples.

(7) ***Kiss*** *od tvoje drugarice*

'A **Kiss** from your friend'

(8) *Pozdrav i* ***kiss*** *od mene*

'Regards and a **kiss** from me'

In an equivalent Serbian closing, a noun ***poljubac*** ('a kiss') would be used, in a singular form, and the above examples would be ***Poljubac*** *od tvoje drugarice*, and *Pozdrav i* ***poljubac*** *od mene*. In English is, however, common to use plural *Kisses* rather than singular, as in NZSEMC.

(9) ***H&K****, Vesna*

This acronym is used only by one participant. Interestingly, instead of typical *XOXO*, my friend shortens *Hugs and Kisses* to *H&K*. Corresponding Serbian greeting would be ***Grli*** *te i* ***ljubi*** *Vesna* ('Vesna **hugs** and **kisses** you') which does not have nouns but verbs.

(10) ***Love****, Mira*

Corresponding Serbian greeting for (10) would also have a verb rather than noun, and would be *Voli te Mira* ('Mira **loves** you').

Male friends use greeting *Hi*, such as in the following example:

(11) ***Hi*** *Ksenija*

Hi is present in messages I received from my male friends, as well as in messages my male friends exchanged between themselves. Serbian equivalents are *zdravo* ('Hi'), used in both formal and informal settings, and ćao (‹Hi›), which is a long time borrowing from Italian.

When I have discussed usage of English greetings with friends who have contributed to my corpus, they have told me that they frequently use them in messages to close friends and relations who live in New Zealand. Sometimes, they use English greetings in the messages they send to friends and relations who live in other English speaking countries or in Serbia, but only to ones that used to live in New Zealand.[9]

People who do not know me well, or not at all, also sometimes use greeting *Hi*. In all examples, without exception, if *Hi* is at the head of message, the sender will need me to do them a favour (such as an urgent translation).

The expressions *please* and *sorry,* too, do not appear to serve only as politeness markers. The senders of messages (12), (13) and (14) seem to be indicating that what they are asking the addressee to do is really important to them. By using the English words, they draw upon that 'special kind of friendship' and try to ensure that the other person will understand the importance of the matter.

(12) *Javi joj* ***please****.*

'Let her know **please**.'

This example is from an e-mail by a friend (F1) who tried to contact me but failed, and now is asking a mutual friend (F2) to pass on his message to me. F1 starts the message with the Serbian equivalent *molim te* ('please'), explains why the matter is of importance and finishes the email by repeating the plea, this time in English. *Please,* which is the only English lexeme in the message, seems to emphasise that the matter is urgent and important.

Like (12), example (13) is from a message in which one friend asks another to do something for him.

(13) ***Plizzzz*** *vidi*

'**Please** see [about it]'

Example (13) uses a Serbian spelling[10] of the borrowed form but with the letter *z* multiplied to further stress that it is important that the friend does what he wants. The lengthening of the fricative draws on a conventional means of signalling 'begging' (especially from lower status to higher status participants, e.g. child to adult) in English-only discourse, which suggests that New Zealand Serbians have mastered the pragmatic norms for English in respect of this word, and are borrowing it with its usage conventions.

Example (14) comes from an e-mail from a close female friend. She starts the e-mail by asking me to send her a few words because she is feeling sad and says that she would like to get an e-mail from me, as that would make her feel better. At the end of e-mail she repeats that she would like to get an e-mail from me:

(14) Ćao*, javi se,* ***please***

'Bye, send me a message, **please**'

It looks like my friend fears that I will understand Serbian *molim te* ('please') only as a politeness marker, so she says *please* as to emphasise the importance

of her plea. Interestingly, this time she does not finish the e-mail with *Love*, or *Kiss*, as she usually does. She ends the message with a common Serbian greeting *ćao,* which is a long time borrowing from Italian, used as both opening and closing salutation.

Sorry is used in a similar manner as *please*.

(15) ***Sorry** za to*

'**Sorry** about that'

The example (15) comes from a text message where a close friend is apologising for not being able to meet me as earlier arranged. She could have used the Serbian equivalent *izvini* ('sorry') but she opts for the English form as it amplifies the feeling of regret.

The example in (16) is similar:

(16) *O **sorry,** ja sam zaboravila na [...]*

'Oh **sorry**, I have forgotten about [...]'

The above example is from an e-mail sent to me by a friend who apologises for forgetting about something we mentioned a few days earlier.[11]

Example (17) is part of an e-mail exchange with an acquaintance.

(17) ***Sorry, sorry, sorry.***

The conversation which (17) comes from was quite formal and all in Serbian, without any borrowings from English. At one point the person did not understand me properly, and after further explanation he answered with the English word *sorry*, repeated three times as he wanted to further stress his apologies.

Thanks also emphasises gratitude, but appears in only a few examples. The reason might be that it has some negative connotations, and could move the conversation to a more formal level:

(18) *Radujem se unapred za knjigu* [...] *Nadam se da si ti onu pročitala i da možeš da mi je vratiš jer nije moja.* ***Thanks***

'I am looking forward to the book [...] I hope you have read the other one, and that you can give it back to me as it is not mine. **Thanks**'

Here, a friend and I are discussing lending Serbian language books to each other. She reminds me that the book she gave me was not hers. A few minutes

later, she sends another message explaining that she is not unhappy I have not returned it already, and that she did not intent to be rude. When I asked what was impolite in her message, she pointed to usage of English *thanks* instead of Serbian *hvala*.

In the NZSEMC corpus, politeness markers borrowed from English are used only among friends and acquaintances, but never among people who do not know each other. In these cases only Serbian forms are used.

The analysis of greetings and politeness markers in New Zealand Serbian indicates that members of Serbian community use them deliberately with the intention of signalling that sender and receiver of message belong to the same social group. They appear to convey a message: "I am a Serbian English bilingual and so are you, the addressee." The identity markers occur in informal settings. They are rarely present in formal setting which confirms that they are not a mistake in selecting language codes, but a conscious choice, and an active stylistic tool.

8. Conclusion

Starting from the premise that discourse markers are particularly prone to borrowing in a bilingual setting, this paper concerns two types of English-origin markers in New Zealand Serbian — markers of sequentiality and identity markers. There is a huge difference in how these two types of markers are used in this relatively new and small immigrant community.

There are only a few occurrences in the NZSEMC of English-origin discourse markers that connect units of discourse. There is one example of *anyway*, two examples of *by the way* and one example of *so* inserted in otherwise Serbian discourse, and one example of *so* in the middle of longer English sentence. All examples are found in the second half of the examined period. On the other hand, the English greetings *love*, *kiss, hugs and kisses* and *hi,* and the politeness markers *please* and *sorry* are used to mark personal and social identities during the whole eight years covered by this study. There are 87 examples of English-origin identity markers, which is 15% of the whole NZSEMC corpus.

None of the borrowed lexemes are gap fillers, as they have equivalents in standard Serbian language. However, while *anyway*, *by the way* and *so* only replace their Serbian equivalents, English greetings and politeness markers are carrying additional implications to their original English meanings.

The fact that the function of sequential markers is the same as in English suggests that the choice of English instead of Serbian lexeme is not intentional and that it can be, as Matras (2000) says, a slippage in the selection of language code. Following Matras' opinion that bilinguals, when choosing between two languages give preference to the "pragmatically dominant and so cognitively advantageous language" (Matras, 2000: 521), I conclude that Serbian is still the dominant language among Serbians who have lived in a bilingual context in New Zealand for the last fifteen to twenty years, and that drives, unconscious, selection of a Serbian over an English marker. However, the fact that these few examples of English-origin sequential markers are found close to the end of the period examined indicates a possible change in the pragmatically dominant language at some point in the future.

English greetings and politeness markers are systematically borrowed but they do not appear to serve as greetings and politeness markers . They seem to have an additional function, they indicate a "special friendship" or to draw upon it, which proves that social motivations have an important role in the borrowing of identity markers. Conscious exploitation of the two language systems to signal group membership and use of English-origin lexemes as a stylistic tool, suggests that when we look at discourse marker borrowing, we need to account for social motivations, and confirms that discourse/pragmatic markers only get their full meaning in a social and cultural context (cf. Archer, Aijmer, & Wichmann, 2012; Schiffrin, 2003).

The NZSEMC data confirms Chamoreau and Léglise's (2012) view that contact-induced changes are a dynamic domain of complex, complementary, and correlated processes and that not everything can be covered by the same explanation. Differences in the frequency and functions of these two types of English-origin discourse markers suggest that language change in this bilingual community can be best understood if multiple aspects of language contact are taken into consideration.

The study raises a number of further questions. Are there any other deliberately transferred English words and phrases in New Zealand Serbian, and if so, what is their function? If Serbian is the dominant language now, will it still be dominant in ten or twenty years' time? Also, if Serbian is the pragmatically dominant language, are any Serbian discourse markers transferred from Serbian into English language discourse? Further research is needed to shed light on these questions.

Notes

1. Paper presented at the 13th Biennial Language and Society Conference, Auckland, New Zealand, 28–29 November 2012.
2. From 1992 till 2006 Serbia was part of Serbia and Montenegro. However, Montenegro is a country with significantly smaller number of inhabitants, so we can presume that most of these people came from Serbia.
3. There is no official data that shows how many Serbians have left New Zealand. My own estimate is more than half.
4. Messages were written without any of the participants knowing that I was interested in borrowings. That interest only coalesced over time. However, all material in the corpus has been contributed with participants' consent.
5. Throughout this article, names of people and places are removed or replaced with pseudonyms and initials to prevent the participant being identified.
6. Acronyms as BTW are typical of EMC.
7. This example is from a sentence in which not only the discourse marker, but the whole sentence is in English.
8. Both *a* and *i* are coordinating conjunctions. While *i* ('and') denotes the addition to the meaning, *a* denotes contrast which can vary from slight to strong, but can never be as strong as *ali* ('but') which indicates total opposition (Hammond, 2005). *A* is usually translated as English 'and' (Benson & Šljivić-Šimšić, 1990).
9. The shared repertoire noticeable here is one of three criterions that define the community (Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 1992; Meyerhoff & Strycharz, 2013). However, the other two criterions (mutual engagement and jointly negotiated enterprise) are satisfied only weakly in this dense network of friends.
10. The use of Serbian orthography with lexical borrowings is not restricted to discourse markers. Orthography related to borrowings in New Zealand Serbian is the subject of an independent analysis, which is part my PhD dissertation on Serbian and English contact phenomena in New Zealand.
11. Here, *sorry* follows the discourse marker *o* ('oh') which signals change in state of knowledge, information, orientation or awareness (Heritage, 1984). While 'oh' is similar phonetically in Serbian and English, the spelling here suggests that the writer is thinking of it as a Serbian lexeme.

References

Archer, Dawn, Karin Aijmer and Anne Wichmann. 2012. *Pragmatics: an Advanced Resource Book for Students*. Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon; New York: Routledge.

Baron, Naomi S. 1998. 'Letters by phone or speech by other means: the linguistics of email.' *Language & Communication 18:* 133–170.

Baron, Naomi S. 2008. *Always on: language in an online and mobile world* Retrieved from http://site.ebrary.com/lib/auckland/Doc?id=10215769

Benson, Morton and Biljana Šljivić-Šimšić. 1990. *SerboCroatian-English dictionary* (3rd ed). Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.

Chamoreau, Claudine and Isabelle Léglise. 2012. 'A multi-model approach to contact-induced language change.' In Claudine Chamoreau and Isabelle Léglise (eds), *Dynamics of contact-induced language change.* Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter Mouton. 1–15.

Clyne, Michael. 1972. 'Some (German-English) language contact phenomena at the discourse level.' In Evelyn Scherabon Firchow et al. (eds), *Studies for Einar Haugen*. The Hague: Mouton. 132–144.

Crystal, David. 2001. *Language and the Internet* Retrieved from http://site.ebrary.com/lib/auckland/Doc?id=5008037

Doucet, Jaques. 1991. 'First generation Serbo-Croatian speakers in Queensland: language maintenance and language shift.' In Suzanne Romaine (ed), *Language in Australia.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 270–248.

Eckert, Penelope and Sally McConnell-Ginet. 1992. 'Communities of practice: where language, gender and power all live.' In Kira Hall, Mary Bucholtz and Birch Moonwomon (eds), *Locating Power: Proceedings of the 1992 Berkeley Women and Language Conference.* Berkeley Berkeley Women and Language Group. 89–99.

Fraser, Bruce. 1990. 'An approach to discourse markers'. *Journal of Pragmatics* 14(3): 383–398. doi: 10.1016/0378-2166(90)90096-v

Fraser, Bruce. 1999. 'What are discourse markers?' *Journal of Pragmatics* 31(7): 931–952. doi: 10.1016/s0378-2166(98)00101-5

Fraser, Bruce. 2009. 'Topic reorientation markers'. *Journal of Pragmatics* 41(5): 892–898.

Gerzic, Ana. 2001. 'Language use and maintenance in Serbian/Croatian speaking community in Auckland and the prospects for the maintenance of Serbian/Croatian language.' In Allan Bell (ed), *The Collection of Student Essays*. Auckland: AUT, Faculty of Arts, School of Languages.

Halliday, M. A. K., and Ruqaiya Hasan. 1976. *Cohesion in English.* London: Longman.

Hammond, Lila. 2005. *Serbian: an Essential Grammar*. New York: Routledge/Taylor and Francis.

Heritage, John. 1984. 'A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement.' In J. Maxwell Atkinson and John Heritage (eds) *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis.* New York: Cambridge University Press. 299–345.

Herring, Susan C. 2003. 'Computer-mediated discourse'. In Deborah Schiffrin, Deborah Tannen and Heidi E. Hamilton (eds), *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Oxford Blackwell Reference Online. doi: 10.1111/b.9780631205968.2003.00004.x

Huang, Yan. 2012. *The Oxford Dictionary of Pragmatics* (1st ed). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jucker, Andreas H., and Yael Ziv. 1998. 'Discourse markers: introduction.' In Andreas H. Jucker and Yael Ziv (eds) *Discourse Markers: Descriptions and Theory*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 1–12.

Klajn, Ivan. 2001. 'Neologisms in present-day Serbian.' *International Journal of Sociology of Language* 151: 89–110.

Maschler, Yael. 1994. 'Metalanguaging and discourse markers in bilingual conversation.' *Language in Society* 23(3): 325–366.

Maschler, Yael. 1997. 'Emergent bilingual grammar: the case of contrast.' *Journal of Pragmatics* 28(3): 279–313. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(96)00085-9

Maschler, Yael. 2000a. 'Toward fused lects: discourse markers in Hebrew English bilingual conversation twelve years later.' *International Journal of Bilingualism* 4(4): 529–561. doi: 10.1177/13670069000040040801

Maschler, Yael. 2000b. 'What can bilingual conversation tell us about discourse markers?: introduction.' *International Journal of Bilingualism 4*(4): 437–445. doi: 10.1177/13670069000040040101

Maschler, Yael. 2009. *Metalanguage in Interaction: Hebrew Discourse Markers*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

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

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

Matras, Yaron. 2009. *Language Contact*. Cambridge, UK; New York: Cambridge University Press.

Matras, Yaron and Jeanette Sakel. 2007. *Grammatical borrowing in cross-linguistic perspective* Retrieved from http://site.ebrary.com/lib/auckland/Doc?id=10256539

Meyerhoff, Miriam and Anna Strycharz. 2013. 'Communities of practice.' In J.K. Chambers and Natalie Schilling (eds) *The Handbook of Language Variation and Change*. (2nd ed).Oxford: John Wiley & Sons. 428–447.

Myers-Scotton, Carol. 1993. *Social Motivations for Codeswitching: Evidence from Africa*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Myers-Scotton, Carol. 2006. *Multiple Voices: an Introduction to Bilingualism* Retrieved from http://www.netLibrary.com/urlapi.asp?action=summary&v=1&bookid=136521

Salmons, Joe. 1990. 'Bilingual discourse marking: code switching, borrowing, and convergence in some German-American dialects.' *Linguistics* 28(3): 453–480.

Sankoff, Gillian, Pierrette Thibault, Naomi Nagy, Hélène Blondeau, Marie-Odile Fonollosa and Lucie Gagnon. 1997. 'Variation in the use of discourse markers in a language contact situation.' *Language Variation and Change* 9(2): 191-217.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. 1987. 'Recycled turn beginnings: a precise repair mechanism in conversation's turn-taking organisation.' In Graham Button and John R. E. Lee (eds), *Talk and Social Organisation.* Clevedon, Avon, England: Multilingual Matters Ltd. 70–85.

Schiffrin, Deborah. 1987. *Discourse Markers*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.

Schiffrin, Deborah. 2003. 'Discourse markers: language, meaning, and context.' In Deborah Schiffrin, Deborah Tannen and Heidi E. Hamilton (eds), *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Oxford Blackwell Reference Online. doi: 10.1111/b.9780631205968.2003.00004.x

Statistics New Zealand. 2007. *2006 Census: Meshblock Dataset*. Wellington: Statistics New Zealand.

Tagg, Caroline. 2011. *The Discourse of Text Messaging: Analysis of Text Message Communication*. New York: Continuum International Pub. Group.

Terkourafi, Marina. 2011. 'Thank you, sorry and please in Cypriot Greek: what happens to politeness markers when they are borrowed across languages?' *Journal of Pragmatics,* 43(1): 218–235. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2010.07.024

Thomason, Sarah Grey. 2001. *Language Contact: an Introduction*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Thomason, Sarah Grey and Terrence Kaufman. 1988. *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.