Bilingualism: Language and Cognition 7 (1), 2004, 89–90 © 2004 Cambridge University Press DOI: 10.1017/S1366728904001294

RESEARCH NOTE

Research note and erratum

CAROL MYERS-SCOTTON
University of South Carolina, Columbia

This note points out an incorrect quotation of the theory of codeswitching outlined in various publications of Carol Myers-Scotton as cited by Boussofara-Omar (2003). In addition, the issue is raised whether the type of multi-lectal situation encountered in the varieties of Arabic spoken in Tunisia should be analyzed with a model designed to deal with 'classic' codeswitching.

An error occurs in Boussofara-Omar (2003) (hereafter B-O), with consequences for B-O's following analysis. B-O purports to cite the definitions from the Matrix Language Frame (MLF) model for the Morpheme Order Principle and the System Morpheme Principle (hereafter SM Principle). In fact, she cites the definition for the Morpheme Order Principle correctly as it appears in Myers-Scotton (hereafter M-S; 1993, p. 83), but not the SM Principle from that page. In B-O's citation (claimed to come from p. 83), a different statement appears from M-S (1993, p. 99).

In its context on p. 99, this statement appears after 'the Principle entails this prediction'. That is, clearly, it is not the SM Principle itself. The p. 99 statement is 'Within ML + EL constituents, *all* active system morphemes are from only one of the languages participating in CS, the ML'. In contrast, the actual SM Principle (p. 83) states 'In ML + EL constituents, all system morphemes which have grammatical relations external to their head constituent (i.e. which participate in the sentence's thematic role grid) will come from the ML'. While the reference on p. 99 is intended as a reference to just this type of morpheme, it is obviously an incomplete paraphrase of the SM Principle itself. But the p. 99 statement is cited by B-O as if it were the formal statement of the SM Principle; it is cited as following the Morpheme Order Principle and as coming from p. 83.

To recap, the actual SM Principle refers to only ONE type of system morpheme as the type that must come only from the ML in ML + EL constituents. The informal paraphrase from p. 99 allows B-O to interpret the MLF model as stating that ALL *active* EL system morphemes must come from the ML in such constituents. It really allows B-O to define what active system morphemes are. However, from the context of the discussion on pp. 98–99 is it clear that 'all active' refers only to the type of morpheme specified in the SM Principle itself. For example, on p. 98, there are these statements: 'The principle contains the hypothesis that if system morphemes are required in ML + EL constituents to signal system relations, they will be ML system morphemes' and 'The principle does not exclude the appearance of EL system morphemes, such as plural affixes on nouns'.

Related to misquoting the SM Principle is another error. B-O incorrectly states that the more recent 4-M model changes the scope of the SM Principle. In fact, the 4-M model simply puts a name on the special type of morpheme to which the SM Principle refers; it does not 're-adjust' the principle. The name is 'outsider late system morpheme'. What is new about the 4-M model is its overt classification of types of morpheme. In this way, it provides a classification for the other two types of system morpheme that are not covered by the SM Principle (early system morphemes and bridge late system morphemes). Yet, in reference to the 4-M model, B-O (p. 40) states that 'Myers-Scotton re-adjusts her claim by arguing that the principle "only predicts that only some, not all, system morphemes must come from the ML"'. (This quotation is cited as coming from M-S (2001, p. 94). In fact, there is no M-S (2001) in the references and the quotation comes from M-S and Jake, 2001, which does appear in the references.)

Tunisian Arabic and classical codeswitching

Another issue worth mentioning in this context is the type of data that THE MLF model purports to cover. The model was formulated to cover codeswitching between language varieties that are separate languages (i.e. not mutually intelligible varieties, such as dialects). I admit that this point is never explicitly stated in the 1993 version. True, the model claimed to cover all cases of CS, but the implicit claim is that these cases involve separate languages. That this is the intention is clear from all the examples that are cited in all references to the MLF model by my associates and me. They are all examples of switching between separate languages. Now, in work later

Address for correspondence
Linguistics Program and English Department, 1620 College St., University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC 29208, USA.
E-mail: *carolms@gwm.sc.edu*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728904001294 Published online by Cambridge University Press

than M-S (1993), I refer to 'composite codeswitching', switching that includes surface morphemes from two or more varieties, BUT ALSO includes abstract grammatical structure FROM MORE THAN ONE PARTICIPATING LANGUAGE in shaping the morphosyntactic frame. I discuss composite codeswitching in several places (e.g. M-S and Jake, 2001; M-S, 2002). Possibly, codeswitching data between two dialects of the same language (e.g. B-O's data) could be analyzed as composite codeswitching. But to be clear, I only discuss and illustrate composite codeswitching; nowhere do I attempt to formally state constraints on this type of switching. To do so is a future project for someone. Further, nowhere do I state that the MLF model can cover such data; it would have to be modified. In contrast to this type of codeswitching, I now refer to what the MLF model DOES cover as 'classic codeswitching': data with surface level morphemes from two or more languages, but with only one language as the source of abstract grammatical structure for the morphosyntactic frame of the relevant CP (or clause).

In B-O (2003), the author's main purpose is to apply the MLF model to data from varieties that are mutually intelligible (i.e. varieties of the same language, Arabic) in order 'to test the model'. It is possible that the model can predict occurrences in such data; if it can, more power to it. But the model was not formulated to cover such data. At this point I want to make only one comment about this attempt.

The counter-examples to the MLF model come from codeswitching between related varieties, not separate languages. Still, even though they come from such data, the particular examples cited as supposed counter-examples to the SM Principle turn out not to be counter-examples. A true violation of the SM Principle would be a Fuṣḥaa agreement system morpheme with a head constituent (a verb in this case) that comes unambiguously from Tunisian Arabic.

Instead, in the cited examples on pp. 39–40 (with Tunisian Arabic as the putative ML), the relevant system morpheme and its verbal head come from Fuṣḥaa, and form what is called an internal EL island. That is, the internal EL island consists of an agreement prefix plus a verb marked for aspect, both coming from Fuṣḥaa (the EL). These morphemes appear in a maximal projection that is framed by the negative affixes from Tunisian Arabic (the affixes can be considered a discontinuous morpheme/morpheme complex). Thus *ʔa-ðunnu* 'I think' is an internal EL island in the larger constituent, *ma-ʔa-ðunnu-ðˤ* 'I do not think'. (For my discussions of internal EL islands, see M-S (1993, pp. 151–154; 2002, pp. 149–152.).

References

Boussofara-Omar, N. (2003). Revisiting Arabic diglossic switching in light of the MLF model and its sub-models: The 4-M model and the Abstract Level model. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 6, 33–46.

Myers-Scotton, C. M. (1993). *Duelling languages: Grammatical structure in codeswitching* (2nd ed. 1997 with a new afterword). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Myers-Scotton, C. M. (2002). *Contact linguistics: Bilingual encounters and grammatical outcomes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Myers-Scotton, C. M. & Jake, J. L. (2001). Explaining aspects of code-switching and their implications. In Nicol, J. L. (ed.), *One mind, two languages: Bilingual language processing*, pp. 84–116. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Received October 27, 2003
Revision received November 19, 2003
Revision accepted November 19, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728904001294 Published online by Cambridge University Press