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Abstract

Language contact phenomena, including loanwords and code-switching, have been the subject of numerous recent studies in sociolinguistics. Loanwords are words borrowed from one language for use in another, while code-switching occurs when speakers mix lexical or grammatical elements from two or more languages in a single speech act. Although numerous studies extensively examine both linguistic phenomena, the boundary between them remains unclear, leaving one to question how to distinguish loanwords from code-switching. Using data from Ch’ol, a Mayan language spoken by more than 100,000 individuals in southeastern Mexico, this paper clearly identifies the characteristics of loanwords and code-switching and outlines the differences between them. This paper argues that on the most basic level, one can distinguish loanwords and code-switching on the basis of assimilation: loanwords demonstrate phonological, morphophonemic, or lexical integration, while code-switched words and phrases do not. Secondary criteria for identifying loanwords include the use of words by speakers of varying levels of bilingualism as well as the absence of native equivalents for specific words. Code-switching is practiced only by bilingual Ch’ols. Through its analysis, this paper argues that code-switching may be indicative of emerging changes in a speaker’s cultural and linguistic identity.
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Introduction

This paper examines language contact phenomena in Ch’ol, a Mayan language of southeastern Mexico, focusing specifically on lexical borrowing and code-switching. While loanwords and code-switching have been discussed by many scholars (Weinreich, 1953; Thomason and Kaufman, 1988; Romaine, 1995; Myers-Scotton, 1982, 1993; Myers-Scotton and Boloyai, 2001; Muysken 1995, 2000; Poplack 1980), the differences between them have not been clearly defined and the boundary between loanwords and code-switching remains unclear. What is a loanword, and how does it become a loanword? What is code-switching, and when does it occur? I focus on the factors that distinguish loanwords from code-switching, identifying the characteristics of each, and outlining the differences between them. The data for this study come from nine migration stories and life histories collected from Ch’ol speakers in the states of Chiapas and Campeche, Mexico. I combine existing definitions of loanwords and code-switching to explain Spanish interference in Ch’ol, and to argue that loanwords of Spanish origin can be distinguished from code-switching on the basis of assimilation. Loanwords have been assimilated into the Ch’ol lexicon, while code-switched words and phrases have not. This assimilation manifests itself in the incorporation of many loans in the native phonological and lexical systems and in the widespread usage of loaned words throughout the speech of all Ch’ol speakers. Loanwords become “native” terms, and may be recognized as such by native Ch’ol speakers. I examine both how and why words of Spanish origin become incorporated into the native Ch’ol lexicon, as this is necessary to distinguish loanwords from code-switching. I propose that loanwords begin as a form of intrasentential code-switching, and become loanwords once they are adopted by all Ch’ol speakers, including monolingual Ch’ol speakers. Code-switched words and phrases, on the other hand, are used exclusively by Ch’ol bilinguals. As a result, I argue that code-switching depends on a speaker’s level of bilingualism, as only Ch’ol bilinguals code-switch. Code-switching is influenced by the degree of outside contact a speaker has experienced, and may represent emerging changes in a speaker’s linguistic and cultural identity.

Language Contact

The effects of language contact, including bilingualism, lexical borrowing, and language interference, have been the focus of extensive
research in the field of sociolinguistics. Cultural and linguistic changes occur when languages come into contact with one another and remain in contact for extended periods of time. The degree of contact-induced change that a language experiences is relative to the intensity of the contact situation (Thomason and Kaufman, 1988:67). Contact situations lasting for long periods of time are likely to induce change because of a speech community's continuous exposure to a foreign language. Language contact may also lead to the emergence of dominant and subordinate languages, which correspond to the establishment of politically dominant and subordinate groups. In situations of contact, each language obtains its own value, though speakers usually regard the dominant language as prestigious and associate it with a higher social value. While both languages influence each other in any situation of contact, the dominant language frequently exhibits stronger influence over the subordinate language, a situation that leads to increased bilingualism in the dominant language among the subordinate population, as well as in linguistic changes in the subordinate language itself (Thomason and Kaufman, 1988:67). These changes first manifest themselves in lexical borrowing, followed later by structural borrowing. Thomason and Kaufman (1988:80) note that Amerindian languages demonstrate a high degree of lexical borrowing as well as some structural borrowing.

Situations of language contact often lead to bilingualism as a result of the need to communicate across languages. Bilingualism gives speakers resources that are not available to monolingual speakers, resources with which they are able to construct socially meaningful verbal interactions. Understanding both the bilingual community and the bilingual individual is essential when considering the connection between bilingualism and language contact. Societal bilingualism occurs when the general population of a community is bilingual in the same two languages (Baetens Beardsmore, 1986:4), and is created by the linguistic forces acting on the community as a whole, including the political, economic, social, and cultural relationships between the languages. Individual bilingualism differs from societal bilingualism in that the individual's entire speech community is not necessarily bilingual. In situations of language contact, bilingual individuals possess personal motivations for becoming bilingual, and may act as mediators or translators between language groups in order to gain personal status (Baetens Beardsmore, 1986:4).
In his classic work on language contact, Weinreich (1953) relates the way in which speakers learn languages to bilingualism, defining coordinate and compound bilingualism. Coordinate bilingualism occurs when a speaker learns each language in a separate environment, thereby distinguishing between them cognitively, and maintaining each language as separate from the other (Weinreich, 1953:9-11). In compound bilingualism, a speaker learns both languages simultaneously, and uses them in the same contexts. Since they are interdependent, these languages become cognitively intermixed, and the speaker has difficulty distinguishing between them. The distinction between these two forms of bilingualism elucidates not only how bilinguals manage language, but also the interaction between languages that can result in language interference.

Scholars have used the term “language interference” to refer to the influence of one language on another in situations of language contact (Weinreich, 1953; Diebold, 1961), as well as to refer specifically to code-switching among bilingual speakers (Weinreich, 1953; Romaine, 1995). In its general application, language interference is “those instances of deviation from the norms of either language which occur in the speech of bilinguals as a result of their familiarity with more than one language, i.e., as a result of language contact” (Weinreich, 1953:1). Types of general language interference include lexical borrowing, or “loanwords”, structural and grammatical borrowing, phonological assimilation, and code-switching (Thomason and Kaufman, 1988; Weinreich, 1953; Romaine, 1995; Muysken 2000). In this study, I focus on lexical borrowing and code-switching, and touch indirectly on phonological assimilation as it relates to loanwords.

“Borrowing” refers to a process in which one language acquires some lexical or structural property from another language (Verbeek, 1998:22). Integration, or borrowing, is “the incorporation of foreign features into a group’s native language by speakers of that language: the native language is maintained but is changed by the addition of the incorporated features” (Thomason and Kaufman, 1988:37). Lexical borrowing involves the adoption of words from one language by another language. These words thus become loanwords, and they thereby extend the vocabulary of the adopted language (Muysken 2000:69-70). Although content words are among the first words that a language adopts as loanwords (Thomason and Kaufman, 1988:74), Brody (1987:507)
documents the widespread usage in Mayan languages of function words borrowed from Spanish, including conjunctions and adverbs, particles, interrogatives, and hesitation markers. As they become incorporated into new lexicons, loanwords often undergo phonological, morphological, and grammatical changes, as well as some changes in meaning, thereby demonstrating assimilation into the borrowing language’s system.

Motivations for lexical borrowing are dependent on contact situations. Words may be initially borrowed for prestige reasons, so that a speaker may demonstrate some knowledge of, or competence in, the dominant language. Though the notion of language prestige is problematic, I use this term to refer to a language that is associated with high social value within a particular speech community. Speakers hope to increase their personal social statuses by using the politically and/or socially dominant language during contact with outgroup members. Amerindian languages also adopt loanwords for items and concepts introduced to indigenous groups by the Spanish, as Verbeeck (1998:31) demonstrates for Mopan Maya. Brown (1994:96-97) presents a list of 77 words for introduced items that have been adopted by indigenous languages throughout the New World, including the words for “apple,” “cheese,” and “mule.”

In addition to loanwords, language interference also manifests itself through code-switching, or the mixing of codes or languages. Gumperz (1982:59) defines code-switching as “the juxtaposition within the same speech exchange of passages of speech belonging to two different grammatical systems or sub-systems”. Code-switching often involves changes in grammar as well as lexicon (Muysken 2000:70), and exists in several different forms: intersentential, intrasentential, and tag-switching. MacSwan (1999:109-113) documents the frequent use of intersentential switching, which typically occurs at sentence or clause boundaries in Amerindian languages, like Nahuatl. Intrasentential switching includes the mixing of codes within a clause, for example, when a sentence is interspersed with words from another language (Romaine, 1995:122-123). Often, speakers interject single words or word phrases from one language in the speech of another language. Tag switching refers to the insertion of tag phrases from one language in another.
Speakers must possess a certain degree of proficiency in more than one language in order to code-switch, since code-switching involves the insertion of appropriate words or phrases from a second language (Muysken 2000; Poplack 1980:615). Muysken (2000:2) argues that speakers who code-switch in daily speech are most often proficient bilinguals who demonstrate fluency in two or more languages. As a result of this proficiency, speakers incorporate both lexical and grammatical elements from each language in their speech. The extensive body of literature on code-switching explores these elements, analyzing when and how speakers code-switch during specific discourse events. Reviewing the work of numerous earlier scholars, Muysken (1995, 2000) examines the lexical and grammatical components of code-switching, stating that three distinct processes explain the types of language interference that manifest themselves in different speech events: insertion, alternation, and congruent lexicalization. Practicing “insertion,” speakers sometimes insert a word or entire lexical phrase from one language into the structure of another (Muysken 2000:3). In other code-switching events, speakers practice “alternation,” by mixing one language’s lexicon and grammatical structure with those of another (Muysken 2000:4). When alternating between languages, speakers only switch codes at points in a sentence where the “juxtaposition of L_1 and L_2 elements does not violate a surface syntactic rule of either language” (Poplack 1980:581). Poplack (1980) explores this phenomenon, presenting the equivalence constraint model of code-switching, stating that individuals switch between languages only at points in which the switch can maintain the grammaticality of both languages and fits in the structures of both languages involved. As a result, speakers mix codes without violating the grammatical rules of either language. In other speech situations, speakers engage in “congruent lexicalization” when they merge words from distinct languages into a new, shared grammatical structure, emerging from the interaction of two distinct grammatical systems, as Muysken (2000:19) describes for Media Quechua speakers in Ecuador. These studies significantly advance our understanding of code-switching by examining the linguistic factors that govern code-switching speech events.

Within the extensive body of literature on code-switching, numerous scholars also focus on the social phenomena that influence a speaker’s
use of code-switching, examining why speakers code-switch in specific speech events. Although code-switching sometimes occurs as the unconscious and natural result of language interaction, numerous studies suggest that bilingual individuals often practice code-switching in order to demonstrate personal relationships, rights, and obligations during a single speech event. Participants as well as the social context, such as location or type of event, govern each speech event (Bauman and Sherzer, 1975:163). In situational switching, the alternation of languages is dependent on components of the speech event, including topic, participants, or setting (Baetens Beardsmore, 1986:49). A change in the components of the speech event often triggers a switch in codes. Situational switching is also occurs because certain topics lend themselves to the use of one language over another.

Code-switching also depends on the social relationships between speakers as often, it allows speakers to ally themselves with the members of one or more linguistic groups, showing solidarity and negotiating relationships (Myers-Scotton, 1982). The Rational Choice Model of Code-switching, proposed by Myers-Scotton and Bolonyai (2001:5), states that code-switching serves as a direct and conscious response to society and social interaction. This model argues that “assumptions of preferences and intentions, and operates on perceived opportunities” motivates speakers to code-switch (Myers-Scotton and Bolonyai, 2001:5). In other words, individuals code-switch as a result of perceived opportunities to enhance status, to forge new relationships, or to strengthen existing relationships. The switch between codes, or the choice of one code over another, may also depend on the degree of social intimacy that speakers have with one another or the level of formality associated with the speech event, as Rubin (1968) demonstrates in the alternation between Guaraní and Spanish in Paraguay. In other instances, code-switching gives speakers the “flexibility of expression” needed to overcome the difficulties of sentence-planning by allowing them to use resources from more than one language (Myers-Scotton and Bolonyai, 2001:5).

Speakers also use code-switching to create privacy or social distance. The speaker may use a switch in codes to create social distance from outgroup members and distinguish himself by speaking a language that others do not understand, as Dozier (1956:150) documents for the Tewa of New Mexico. The choice of one code over another may give the
speaker privacy in public settings. He may switch codes in order to speak more freely and to ensure the privacy of his conversation. In other instances, a speaker may choose one code over another in situations in which that language is dominant and is considered to be prestigious. The desire to elevate one’s status may motivate a speaker to code-switch in order to demonstrate knowledge of the dominant language in contact situations. Since the contact period, Spanish has served as the dominant language of Latin America, and as a result, indigenous peoples throughout the region have considered it to be a powerful code worthy of emulation and use in situations of contact with non-indigenous groups or individuals (Brody, 1987:509; Verbeeck, 1998:16).

The desire to demonstrate ethnic and linguistic identity also motivate the use of code-switching in bilingual speakers. In its most basic sense, ethnic identity is based on cultural criteria that differentiate one group of people from others (Barth, 1969:11). Linguistic identity is linked to a speaker’s ethnicity, and refers to the symbols and speech conventions that are characteristic of a particular group (Gumperz, 1982:6). By using these symbols, a speaker signals his membership in a particular cultural or social group (Torras and Garafanga, 2002:545). Linguistic changes often indicate changes in one’s linguistic identity, since the use of language, or of different codes, may act as a linguistic boundary that separates one group of speakers from others (Urciuoli, 1995:538-539). This boundary often shapes the linguistic identity of bilingual speakers, separating them from monolingual speakers, as Bailey (2000:563) suggests is the case for Dominican-American Spanish-English bilinguals. By using language to mark one’s ethnic identity, speakers may act as agents of social change, and use their behavior in order to shape, define, and create social realities.

A large part of the research on language interference has focused on distinguishing loanwords from code-switching. Haugen (1956) first proposed a distinction between lexical integration (lexical borrowing) and interference (code-switching), terms that were later adopted by other scholars in their discussions of language contact phenomena (Thomason and Kaufman, 1988; Romaine, 1995; Verbeeck, 1998). According to his model, loanwords vary from code-switching on the basis of integration: lexical borrowings became “integrated” in native lexical systems while code-switched words did not. Integrated words often demonstrated phonological, morphological, and syntactic changes. Myers-Scotton
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(1993:165), however, argues against these ideas and suggests that the primary criterion that should be used in separating the two is frequency of occurrence; any word that appears at least three times in a corpus of data is a loanword (Myers-Scotton, 1993:207). Both of these suggestions are included in Poplack and Sankoff’s model, which argues that loanwords can also be characterized by “native-synonym displacement,” or the displacement of a native term by a loan, and “acceptability,” or the recognition by native speakers that a word is an acceptable and integrated part of the native lexicon (1984:103-104).

Muysken’s (1995, 2000) definitions of alternation and congruent lexicalization also aid in establishing the differences between loanwords from code-switching, as these processes serve as important criteria for separating the two language contact phenomena. For example, since alternation and congruent lexicalization occur as the result of interference on a grammatical level, they indicate that a speaker is code-switching, as they mark a speaker’s use of two or more languages. As a result, when linguistic analysis reveals these processes at work in a particular speech act, one can identify the presence of foreign words as code-switching, rather than lexical borrowings. However, this distinction is not as clear in the process of insertion, which deals with intrasentential switches, when speakers insert a single word or phrase of words into the given structure of another language. Since this process occurs at a lexical rather than grammatical level, it can be indicative of both lexical borrowings and code-switches (Muysken 1995:180). As a result, the notion of insertion further blurs the line between loanwords and code-switching, by ignoring the social phenomena that shape these linguistic practices.

In recent publications, numerous scholars comment that the boundary between these language contact phenomena remains unclear despite this extensive body of literature. Torres (2002:78) documents this problem in her analysis of bilingual discourse markers in Puerto Rican Spanish. Torres concludes that it is difficult to determine whether discourse markers act as loans or as code-switching in the speech of Puerto Rican bilinguals. In discussing the integration of certain loanwords in other languages, Muysken (2000:71) emphasizes the difficulty of distinguishing loans from code-switching, stating that “we really have no criteria to determine whether it [a word] is code-mixing or borrowing.” When I first began my research on Ch’ol, I also experienced this confusion, find-
difficulty in separating loanwords from code-switching. The question remains: how does one determine if a non-native word is a loan or if it represents code-switching? I argue that in order to separate lexical borrowings from code-switches and clarify the distinction between them, one must not analyze only the linguistic elements of code-switching and borrowing, as Muysken (1995, 2000) does, but rather consider both the social as well as linguistic factors that influence these language contact phenomena.

**Data and Methodology**

My research is part of a growing corpus of knowledge in the field of sociolinguistics, more specifically in the ethnography of speaking (Hymes, 1962; Bauman and Sherzer, 1974), since I focus on the variables associated with certain speech acts and events. The data for this study were collected during the summers of 2001 and 2002, as part of a larger project studying the Ch’ol Diaspora in the states of Chiapas and Campeche, Mexico (Hopkins, 2002). I gathered data through ethnographic research and recorded interviews that enabled me to analyze language interference, both generally and specifically, in the speech of a diverse sample of Ch’ol speakers. The interviews were generally conducted in Ch’ol, and extensive Spanish influence was noted throughout.

A part of the Greater Ch’olan language family (Kaufman 1976), Ch’ol is spoken widely throughout the states of Chiapas and Campeche, Mexico, by more than 100,000 speakers (Hopkins, 1995:61). The majority of the Ch’ol population is concentrated in Chiapas, in the large highland towns of Tila, Tumbalá, and Sabanilla, an area that has been considered the Ch’ol homeland since Spanish contact in the mid-sixteenth century (Hopkins, 1995:63). The municipios, or “counties” of Salto de Agua and Palenque in the Chiapas lowlands are also home to many Ch’ol settlements. Although the Ch’ols have been in close contact with Spanish language and culture since the colonial period, they have remained both culturally and linguistically strong. A large percentage of the Ch’ol population is still monolingual, especially in Tila and Tumbalá, where Ch’ol is the dominant language and many ladinos (the local term for non-indigenous individuals) learn Ch’ol in order to communicate. In Tumbalá, Ch’ol children attend bilingual schools where they are taught in both Ch’ol and Spanish. Ch’ol is spoken during community meetings in both the ejidos and the highland centers, and the mayors
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(and most other officials) of both Tila and Tumbalá are native Ch’ol speakers. Speakers also use Ch’ol in meetings with the Instituto Nacional Indígena, the National Indigenous Institute, or “INI,” the agency created by the Mexican government to protect and promote indigenous rights. Ch’ols put great emphasis on the ability to speak well, paying great respect to the verbal arts, including the ability to tell folktales (Hopkins, 1995:66). This respect extends to Ch’ols bilingual or multilingual in Spanish or other Mayan languages, such as Tzotzil or Tzeltal, also spoken in highland Chiapas (Kathryn Josserand, personal communication).

During the past twenty-five years, several thousand Ch’ol speakers have left Chiapas, migrating to new areas where they have resettled. Today, over two-dozen Ch’ol communities have been established in the Xpujil region of the state of Campeche, Mexico, in the newly formed municipio of Calakmul. The increasing land shortage experienced in Chiapas motivated these migrations, which were also facilitated by the ejido system, implemented following the Mexican revolution (Hopkins, 1985:4). In the ejido system, land is awarded to a specified number of heads of families, who collectively hold the rights to the land. Until recently, this land could not be bought or sold, and the ejido system requires that the rights to land may only be passed down to one child (Hopkins, 1995:64). The fact that many Ch’ols do not inherit ejido lands has forced them to relocate, since they are subsistence farmers that rely on the land in order to support themselves.

Research on Ch’ol and other Mayan languages has revealed the existence of many distinct genres of speech (Bricker, 1974; Gossen, 1974, 1999). This paper’s focus on migration narratives and life histories proves interesting for exploring the distinction between loanwords and code-switching. In contrast to other genres of Ch’ol speech, such as folktales (Alejos García, 1988; Whittaker and Warkentin, 1965), political discourse (Alejos García, 1994), ritual language (Pérez Chacón, 1988), jokes, and prayers (Meneses, 1986), migration narratives and life histories reveal personal information about speakers’ lives. Hopkins and Josserand (1990) and Altman (1996) have described variations in the structure and use of Ch’ol associated with different genres of speech. The analysis of language integration and interference that I present in this paper is based exclusively on Ch’ol migration narratives and life.
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histories, and should be considered representative only of this specific genre of speech.

Ch’ol migration narratives begin with what Hopkins (2002) calls “an emerging migration mythology” that tells of a land shortage and of a difficult journey to find new land. Speakers relate the challenges faced in establishing new communities and in settling new areas. They often discuss their childhood as well as their adult lives, and comment on education, family, religion, and involvement in the government and in governmental affairs. Events are not necessarily presented chronologically in the narratives, though these narratives typically end when speakers finish presenting the details of their current living situation.

We collected the migration narratives and life histories of nine Ch’ol speakers in an interview format in which speakers were asked to recount their own personal histories as well as the histories of their families and their towns. Most of the speakers that we interviewed were Ch’ol-Spanish bilinguals, though the narrative of one monolingual Ch’ol speaker was recorded. We recorded all but one of the interviews in the informants’ homes in a familial setting; often, family members were present. One interview was recorded in the informant’s office in a private room, with only the informant herself and the researchers present. When possible, we recorded interviews using a standard tape recorder, a DAT recorder, and a digital video recorder. While one member of our research team was a Spanish-Ch’ol bilingual, the rest of us were Spanish-English bilinguals who possess varied levels of ability in Ch’ol.

The sample of Ch’ol speakers I use in this study is varied in terms of geographical region, age, ethnicity, and bilingual ability. I include speakers from both highland and lowland Chiapas in the sample, as well as speakers from the new Ch’ol communities in Campeche. Speakers’ ages ranged from 25 to 65 years old, and both men and women were interviewed. Both Ch’ol and ladino bilinguals, as well as a Ch’ol monolingual, were recorded in order to investigate the connection between ethnicity and degree of language interference.

Table 1 presents a list of the speakers with their demographic information. This table is arranged according to the speaker’s bilingual ability. I first present the monolingual informant, followed by the Ch’ol Spanish-bilinguals who are ethnically Ch’ol. Finally, I list the bilingual ladinos included in this sample.
### Table 1: Demographic Characteristics of Ch’ol Informants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Initials</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Personal Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>JTL</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>La Cascada, Chiapas</td>
<td>Monolingual Ch’ol Married to Ch’ol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>MSG</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Chichonal, Campeche</td>
<td>Bilingual Ch’ol Married to Ch’ol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>MSM</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Chichonal, Campeche</td>
<td>Bilingual Ch’ol Married to Ch’ol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>AMT</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Arroyo Negro, Campeche</td>
<td>Bilingual Ch’ol Married to Ch’ol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>RLV</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>La Cascada, Chiapas</td>
<td>Bilingual Ch’ol Married to Ch’ol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>AGV</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Justo Sierra, Campeche</td>
<td>Bilingual Ch’ol Married to Ch’ol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>JPM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Tumbalá, Chiapas</td>
<td>Bilingual Ch’ol Frequent contact w/ ladino culture Learned languages simultaneously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>ASH</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Tumbalá, Chiapas</td>
<td>Bilingual ladina Married to Ch’ol Learned languages simultaneously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>ACG</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Palenque, Chiapas</td>
<td>Bilingual ladino Married to ladina Learned languages simultaneously</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In an attempt to determine how one can distinguish loanwords from code-switching, I listened carefully to each narrative, noting every instance of Spanish interference, including both single words and phrases. I conducted a simple statistical analysis of the number of Span-
ish-derived words in relation to the number of total words in each narrative to gauge the extent of general language integration and interference present in each sample of Ch’ol speech. I then grouped all the instances of each word to determine the contexts in which they were used and to see if their usage was widespread. Spanish words used across geographical regions as well as by speakers of varied bilingual ability were then analyzed for phonological assimilation and were classified according to semantic domain. My next step was to determine if these words had Ch’ol equivalents. I also used the Diccionario Ch’ol-Español (Aulie and Aulie, 1978) and Säkläji’b Ty’añ Ch’ol, a monolingual Ch’ol dictionary (Montejo López, Rubén López et al., 2001), to determine what words of Spanish origin were considered to be “normal” Ch’ol vocabulary. I compiled a list of assimilated loans, or loans demonstrating the use of Ch’ol phonology, widespread usage, and, often, the absence of Ch’ol equivalents, from the data collected from both the narratives and the dictionaries. I compared over 200 assimilated words to the other words of Spanish origin not included in the list to identify the characteristics that make them distinct, and to determine ways in which lexical borrowings are distinct from code-switching. Numerous examples of both intrasentential and intersentential code-switching occurred in these narratives, though I focus on mostly on insertions, or intrasentential switching in this analysis, as they are the most relevant to the question of distinguishing loanwords from code-switching.

Analysis

The number of words of Spanish origin present in the migration narratives provides an estimate of general language interference in Ch’ol speech. Nine speakers were included in my overall study, but only the narratives of Speakers 1-5 and Speaker 9 could be included in this calculation because the other interviews had not been fully transcribed. As a result, the sample used for this calculation includes one monolingual Ch’ol, four Ch’ol bilinguals, and one bilingual ladino. Nevertheless, although I include only one monolingual Ch’ol and one bilingual ladino in my formal analysis due to the limitations of the speech samples we collected in the field, my informal observations of other monolingual Ch’ols and bilingual ladinons while in Mexico support the results of my analysis.1
The overall percentage of Spanish-derived words in this Ch’ol sample was 19%. Ch’ol bilinguals exhibited between 23% and 27% interference, a figure above the average. The Ch’ol monolingual interviewed exhibited only 10% interference, while the bilingual ladino demonstrated 16%, both figures under the 19% average (Table 2). The high percentage of interference in the speech of Ch’ol bilinguals reflects more extensive contact with ladino and Mexican national culture; bilingual Ch’ols also engage in more code-switching behavior than monolingual Ch’ols and bilingual ladinos, a phenomenon I will discuss in greater detail in the following section.

**Phonological and Lexical Assimilation of Loans**

Words of Spanish origin used in Ch’ol usually demonstrate assimilation to Ch’ol phonological patterns. The absence of specific phonemes in Ch’ol that are present in Spanish causes certain borrowed words to undergo phonological change during the process of integration into Ch’ol lexicon. Words that exhibit assimilation may be considered integrated loanwords when they show a regular shift from the Spanish phonological system to the Ch’ol phonological system, thereby indicating that they have become part of the “native” lexicon. The words I have
identified as loanwords show a regular shift from the Spanish phonological system to Ch’ol phonology in the speech of all speakers. For example, in Ch’ol, the Spanish phoneme /f/ regularly changes to /p/ or /hw/ (Koob, 1979:113). The Spanish word /finka/ ‘farm’, becomes /pinka/ in Ch’ol, and /kafé/ ‘coffee’, becomes /kahwe/. The Spanish /g/ often devolves, and becomes /k/ or is replaced by /w/ during the process of assimilation (Koob, 1979:113), as seen in changes from the Spanish /ganar/ to the Ch’ol /kanar/ ‘to earn’, /iglesia/ to /klesia/ ‘church’, and /amigo/ to /amiwo/ ‘friend’. Other changes are seen in the reduction of Spanish /bw/ to /w/ in borrowed words like /weno/ (<<bweno/>) ‘good’, and in the change from Spanish /d/ to Ch’ol /r/ or /l/ (Koob 1979:114) in /karena/ (<<kadena/), ‘chain’, and /pale/ (<<padre/), ‘father’. In general, vowels remain the same in borrowed words, though a shift from Spanish /o/ to Ch’ol /u/ following /r/ (Koob, 1979:113) can be seen in the assimilation of Spanish words like /puro/ ‘pure’, /aros/ ‘rice’, and /litro/ ‘liter’, to /puru/, /’arus/, and /litru/.

Considering the age of Spanish-derived words used in Ch’ol is also useful in identifying a word as a loanword. Loans adopted during the Spanish-contact period reflect colonial Spanish pronunciation, thereby signaling their early incorporation into Ch’ol lexicon. At the time of contact, the Spanish orthographic <ll>, now /y/, was pronounced as palatalized /l/ (Canfield, 1962:70). This phenomenon is demonstrated by the Ch’ol word /kučilu/ ‘knife’, now /kučiyō/ in modern Spanish. Canfield (1962:72) also states that the modern Spanish phoneme /x/, now a voiceless velar fricative, was pronounced as /š/ in all dialects of sixteenth century Spanish. This observation may be evidence for the early incorporation of words like /šalaša/ from /naranšas/ ‘oranges’, /kaša/ from /kaša/ ‘box’, and /šapom/ from /šabon/ ‘soap’. Colonial Spanish retroflex /s/ may also be replaced by /š/, as seen in /borsa/, derived from /bolsa/ ‘bag’, and in /wakaš/, derived from /bakas/ ‘cows’. Another important phonological difference that must be noted is that during the contact period, the aspirated /h/, which has dropped out of modern Spanish, was still pronounced (Canfield, 1962:73). This idea that explains the fact that /h/ is still pronounced as a voiceless vocoid in the Ch’ol form of /hača/, now Spanish /ača/, or ‘axe’.

Borrowed Spanish words also assimilate to Ch’ol morphology and word structure during the process of integration, becoming more like
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Ch’ol words and less like their original Spanish forms. Ch’ol word roots most often take the shape of CVC. Few consonant clusters exist, and certain clusters are not tolerated in Ch’ol. Borrowed Spanish words that have become integrated loanwords assimilate, dropping non-Ch’ol characteristics during the process of integration into the Ch’ol lexicon. For example, in Ch’ol, the Spanish word /alkalde/ ‘mayor’, has become /ahkal/, /kristiano/ ‘Christian’ has become /kišt’ano/, and /erño/ ‘brother’, has become /erano/, each word losing one of its consonant clusters. In doing so, each word has adapted to a form that is more typical of Ch’ol. These changes, as well as the phonological changes mentioned above, represent linguistic syncretism. Loanwords are thus merged with the native phonological system and native lexicon, and for this reason, are often not identified as distinct or different from native words by the speakers of that language. Ch’ol speakers may not recognize Spanish loanwords as having Spanish origin; instead, they may consider these words to be Ch’ol words as a result of their assimilation and integration into the native Ch’ol lexicon.

Loanwords also contrast with code-switching based on the fact that they are used by speakers with different degrees of bilingualism, thereby demonstrating widespread use. I grouped the words of Spanish origin used in Ch’ol according semantic domains that I selected in order to analyze the frequency with which words of Spanish origin are used as well as to look at the meanings of borrowed words. I organized these words into thirteen domains: kin terms, numbers and measurements, government, education, religion, plants, animals, other introduced items, domestic life, function words, discourse markers, adjectives, and verbs. Words of Spanish origin from each of these domains are used by many Ch’ol speakers, regardless of their bilingual ability. Their usage is widespread, and they are used by monolingual Ch’ol speakers as well as by bilingual Ch’ols and bilingual ladinos during many different speech events. The adoption of these words is motivated by specific social and cultural factors, including the introduction of new items into Ch’ol life. Identifying the reasons why specific words or classes of words are borrowed into Ch’ol further clarifies the criteria for distinguishing loanwords from code-switching (Table 3).
Table 3: Selected Loanwords Used by all Ch’ol Speakers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ch’ol</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ajkal</td>
<td>alcalde</td>
<td>mayor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amiwo</td>
<td>amigo</td>
<td>friend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anka</td>
<td>aunque</td>
<td>although</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>día</td>
<td>día</td>
<td>day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ejido</td>
<td>ejido</td>
<td>ejido</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eran</td>
<td>hermano</td>
<td>brother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaxlan</td>
<td>castellano</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kawayu</td>
<td>caballo</td>
<td>horse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaša</td>
<td>kaja</td>
<td>box</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ke</td>
<td>que</td>
<td>that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kistyano</td>
<td>cristiano</td>
<td>Christian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>klesia</td>
<td>iglesia</td>
<td>church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ko</td>
<td>como</td>
<td>like/how</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kuchilu</td>
<td>cuchillo</td>
<td>knife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kumarej</td>
<td>comadre</td>
<td>comadre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kumparee</td>
<td>compadre</td>
<td>compadre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maestru</td>
<td>maestro</td>
<td>maestro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mama</td>
<td>mama</td>
<td>mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ora</td>
<td>ahora</td>
<td>now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pašyo</td>
<td>falso</td>
<td>false</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pensalin</td>
<td>pensar</td>
<td>to think/to be sad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peru</td>
<td>pero</td>
<td>but</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pinca</td>
<td>finca</td>
<td>farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>porke</td>
<td>porque</td>
<td>because/why</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pos</td>
<td>pues</td>
<td>well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>puru</td>
<td>puro</td>
<td>pure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>solo</td>
<td>solo</td>
<td>only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tose</td>
<td>entoneses</td>
<td>then</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tyempo</td>
<td>tiempo</td>
<td>time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wakax</td>
<td>vacas</td>
<td>cows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weñ</td>
<td>bien</td>
<td>fine/good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yorajlel</td>
<td>hora</td>
<td>hour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many function words and discourse markers as well as words used in everyday domestic life can be identified as loanwords based on the fact that they are used by all Ch’ol speakers, regardless of bilingual ability.
Twenty-four function words of Spanish origin, including /peru/ ‘but’, /por/ ‘because’, /ke/ ‘that’, /por/ ‘by’, /kyen/ ‘who’, /donde/ ‘where’ and several variations of /komo/ ‘how’, are used regularly throughout Ch’ol speech. Seven discourse markers, including /entonse/ ‘therefore’ or ‘then’, /este/ ‘um’, and /weno/ ‘well’, also demonstrated widespread usage. The fact that these words are used repeatedly by different speakers in different speech events, and that they are used by monolingual Ch’ols with limited knowledge of Spanish demonstrates their incorporation into the Ch’ol lexicon as integrated loanwords.

Words pertaining to domestic life may have initially been incorporated into Ch’ol since they are common words that speakers use frequently in daily speech. If speakers initially borrowed words for prestige reasons to demonstrate knowledge of and competence in the dominant language, Spanish, words used in daily life may have been among the first words borrowed. In this sample, I observed 22 words of Spanish origin for household items, common everyday objects, and essential elements of Ch’ol life, including /limet/on(</limeton/) ‘large jug’, /lat/yu(</plato/) ‘plate’, kusina(</kosina/) ‘kitchen’, /rebus/(</reboso/) ‘shawl’, /hente(</xente/) ‘people’, /awada/(</awada/) ‘water hole’. Their prominence and regular usage throughout Spanish discourse enables speakers to become familiar with them, which allows these words to be easily adopted from Spanish. These words often act as synonyms for existing native words, and sometimes exhibit slightly altered meanings from their native equivalents.

The regular use of common verbs and adjectives in Spanish discourse may cause these words to become loanwords. I identify these words as loanwords based on the fact that they occur regularly throughout the speech of Ch’ol speakers and are used by monolingual as well by bilingual speakers. These words appear in all contexts, when speakers address daily life, family life, or their personal histories. These words also may have become integrated as loanwords originally as a result of speakers’ desire to demonstrate their ability to speak Spanish, the dominant language and thereby enhance personal status. Among the adjectives are /wen/ ‘well’ or ‘fine’, derived from the Spanish /byen/, /payšo/ ‘false’, from the Spanish /falso/, /todo/ ‘all’, /solo/ ‘only’, and /malo/ ‘bad’. Ten common verbs, including /solisitar/ ‘to request’, /kanar/ ‘to earn’, /sufir/ ‘to suffer’, and /mantener/ ‘to maintain’, are also loan-
words. When borrowed, however, these many verbs do not appear alone, but rather are used with auxiliary verbs, as seen in the following example from Speaker 4.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Tza kaj} & \quad \text{ksolisitarin} \quad \text{klum}.
\text{Tza' kaj-0} & \quad \text{k-solisitar-in} \quad \text{k-lum}.
\text{Com vin-B3} & \quad \text{A1-vtr-suf} \quad 1s-n
\end{align*}
\]
I began to solicit my land...

Many of these verbs, including /pensalin/, from the Spanish /pensar/ and /solisitarin/ from the Spanish /solisitar/ demonstrate regular morphophonemic integration in Ch’ol discourse, as they take the /-in/ verbal ending used by derived intransitive verbs in Ch’ol. /Pensarin/ exhibits complete integration into Ch’ol lexicon as it takes on a new meaning in Ch’ol. In Spanish, /pensar/ means ‘to think’ while in Ch’ol it means ‘to be sad’ (Aulie and Aulie, 1978:92).

Words that have no native equivalents can also be identified as loanwords as opposed to code-switching if they demonstrate widespread usage and are used by speakers with varying degrees of bilingualism. These words usually correspond to the introduction of new items of material culture, ideologies, or rituals and religious beliefs, and become loanwords as a result of the absence of native terms for these items. Like function words and discourse markers, these words of Spanish origin are used by all Ch’ol speakers, regardless of their bilingual ability. Eight of the thirteen identified domains include words for new items that were introduced into Ch’ol culture through Spanish contact, and for this reason, are words that have no Ch’ol equivalents.

Kin terms and numerical terminology have become loanwords because the introduction of these new linguistic terms corresponds to a shift in these systems. Since Spanish kin and numerical systems were introduced during the contact period and indigenous peoples throughout the region acculturated to these new and dominant systems (Hopkins, 1988:104), their corresponding linguistic terms were adopted by Ch’ols at this early date, becoming integrated into the native lexicon. The shift from the traditional Ch’ol kin system to a system more like that used by the Spanish (Hopkins, 1988:104; Hopkins, 1995:64) is reflected linguistically in the adoption of sixteen kin terms, including blood kin, (/mama/ ‘mama’, /papa/ ‘papa’, /eran/ ‘brother’, /ermana/ ‘sister’) and “fictional”
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kin (/komare/ 'godmother', /kompare/ 'godfather'), as well as friendship (/amiwo/). Contact with ladino culture also resulted in the change from a traditional vigesimal numerical system to the Spanish decimal system. Spanish numbers have replaced the native Ch'ol number terms: during my research, I noted that many speakers cannot count above ten in Ch'ol and that they almost exclusively use Spanish numbers when speaking. I also observed 12 borrowed words referring to units of time and measurements, including /anyo/ 'year', /dia/ 'day', /yorahlel/ 'hour', /t'empo/ 'time', /litru/ 'liter', /lewa/ 'league', and /kilometru/ 'kilometer'. The adoption of these terms corresponded to the shift from the traditional Maya calendric system to the Gregorian calendar and European conceptions of time, also introduced throughout the Maya region during the contact period.

The Spanish and ladino governments also imposed new systems of education, government, and religion on Ch'ol speakers, and as a result, Spanish terms have been adopted and integrated into Ch'ol lexicon in order to refer to these systems. These systems themselves, as well as the ideologies behind them, were introduced to Ch'ol life through contact with ladino culture. I observed seven loaned education terms in my sample. Since the children of most Ch'ol towns attend government-run schools, words of Spanish origin, like /maestro/ 'teacher', /estudiar/ 'to study', /eskwela/ 'school', and /profesor/ 'professor', are an essential part of Ch'ol vocabulary. Among the 19 terms for governmental offices, positions, and land distribution used in my sample are /presidente/ 'president', /hwes/ 'judge', /munisipio/ 'county', /kolonia/ 'colony', /ejido/ 'ejido', and /ofisina/ 'office', all concepts that were introduced to the Ch'ol by the Mexican government. The introduction of Christianity, primarily the Catholicism of the colonial period, led to the integration of new Spanish religious terminology into the Ch'ol lexicon. I noted the use of 16 religious terms in my sample, many of which refer to Catholic practices and beliefs, including /kostumbre/ 'custom', /rus/ 'cross', /espiritu/ 'spirit', /resal/ 'to pray', and /birhen/ 'virgin'.

Contact with the Spanish also introduced to Ch'ol daily life plants and animals not native to the New World, as well new material items and technologies. Continued contact with ladino and Mexican national culture has brought new technologies like electricity to Ch'ol communities. Eight plant terms, five animal terms, and 15 words for other introduced items were regularly used in this sample. All of these words are loan-

My analysis of language contact phenomena in Ch’ol also reveals the emergence of a new semantic domain of Spanish words, “Progress Words”, which Ch’ol bilinguals use throughout their migration narratives. This domain includes words that refer to the ideology of technological development, advancement, and progress that has come from contact with the Mexican government and governmental programs. Progress words presently occupy a liminal position in Ch’ol discourse, as they no longer occur merely as the result of code-switching, but have yet to become a fully integrated part of the Ch’ol lexicon. This lack of integration manifests itself in the fact that only politically active bilingual Ch’ols use progress words, as monolingual speakers have not yet adopted these words as a part of their daily discourse.

Through this analysis, I have identified four words used throughout migration narratives that belong to this domain: /lograr/ ‘to achieve’, /mehoramiento/ ‘improvement’, /progresa/ ‘progress’, and /ini/, the acronym for the Instituto Nacional Indigena. The first three words refer to the ideology of progress that contact with governmental agencies that promote technological development and advancement has introduced to Ch’ol life. INI is the governmental agency with which politically active Ch’ols have the most contact and which represents indigenous interests to the national government. Since native Ch’ol equivalents for these terms do not exist, I suggest that in migration narratives, Ch’ol speakers use progress words as loans. However, because monolingual speakers do not yet use them, one cannot classify progress words as fully integrated loans. As a result, I argue these words actually represent a bridge between loanwords and code-switching. I propose that the increased importance of these words in Ch’ol life and their increased usage in Ch’ol discourse over time may result in the future total integration of these words as loanwords.
Loanwords vs. Code-switching: Identifying Code-switched Words and Phrases

By analyzing examples of code-switching and considering the speaker’s bilingual ability, one can further identify the important differences between loanwords and code-switching. Code-switched words and phrases do not demonstrate assimilation or integration into the native phonological system; instead, they maintain their original phonology. Ch’ol speakers pronounce these words as they should be pronounced according to Spanish phonology, thereby marking a switch in codes. Code-switched words have not been syncretized linguistically, and they can be separated from the native lexicon and identified as distinct by the speakers themselves.

A speaker’s bilingual ability strongly influences his use of code-switching. Bilingual speakers often code-switch when speaking to other bilinguals, or when the speech event requires them to demonstrate their bilingualism. This phenomenon can be explained by the fact that in order to code-switch, a speaker must be proficient in two or more languages. In this sample, only bilingual Ch’ols code-switched; monolingual Ch’ols and bilingual ladinos did not code-switch. Being proficient in both Spanish and Ch’ol allows bilingual Ch’ols to code-switch regularly and easily. The result of their frequent and intense contact with Mexican and ladino culture is that these speakers can express themselves freely and comfortably in both Spanish and Ch’ol. If these speakers have learned Spanish and Ch’ol simultaneously, or grew up speaking both languages, they may not make clear, cognitive distinctions between them, according to Weinreich’s definition of compound bilingualism (1953:9-11).

Monolingual Ch’ols and bilingual ladinos did not code-switch in their migration narratives. Monolingual Ch’ol speakers have limited knowledge of Spanish and are not likely to code-switch. Spanish influence on their speech manifests itself exclusively in the use of loanwords. Speaker 1, the monolingual speaker included in this sample, experienced significantly less general Spanish interference than other speakers, exhibiting no code-switching and using only integrated loanwords. Bilingual ladinos also did not code-switch. Though they used integrated loanwords, code-switched words and phrases were not used in their narratives. Since Ch’ol is a second language for many ladinos, they experience coordinate bilingualism, as defined by Weinreich (1953:9-11), and
for this reason, maintain both languages as separate from one another, making a clear distinction between them. The fact that bilingual ladinos rarely code-switched may also be explained by considering prestige as a motivation for code-switching. If Ch’ol-Spanish code-switching is motivated by the desire to demonstrate proficiency in Spanish, the socially dominant language, in order to gain social status and prestige, it is logical to assume that bilinguals that are native Spanish speakers would not experience the same need to code-switch as bilingual Ch’ols.

Unlike loanwords, code-switched words do not demonstrate widespread usage and often have native Ch’ol equivalents. Code-switched words and phrases are not used by Ch’ol monolinguals, and occur infrequently in the speech of bilingual ladinos. Code-switched words are used on an individual basis in specific contexts. The use of code-switched words and phrases is not regular, and each usage is dependent on the speaker’s preferences within that speech event or act. Code-switched words do not appear consistently in the speech of many Ch’ols, and are used exclusively in the speech of Ch’ol bilinguals. There is no specific pattern of usage that can be identified for individual Spanish words. Code-switched words and phrases in Spanish are often intermixed in the discourse of Ch’ol bilinguals, a flexibility of expression that allow speakers to communicate better. Code-switching may also occur as interference, as the result of the cognitive interference of the two languages in bilinguals. Ch’ol bilinguals often alternate freely between codes, as seen in the following example, where Speaker 5, a Ch’ol bilingual, code-switches, using non-assimilated Spanish words throughout his Ch’ol speech. To represent the change in codes, I have marked the Spanish phrases in italics, while the Ch’ol phrases are in regular print:

Lo que más jodido, cholero papá, cholero mamá; eso,
Lo ke’ mas jodido, cholero papa, cholero mama; ‘eso,
Lo que mas jodido, cholero papa, cholero mama; ‘eso,
What’s more f*cked up, his father [is a] Ch’ol speaker, his mother [is a] Ch’ol speaker;

‘eso, muku  ti chol yotot, cholce hách, aha. Ejke medio ma’iš tonto abla,
‘eso mu-ku-0  t’i chol y-o’tot’, chole hách, ‘aha. Es ke medio ma’iš tonto abla,
‘eso inc-vtr-B3 loc n 3s-n,  n-diec adj, part. Es ke medio ma’iš tonto abla, that is, they speak Ch’ol at home, just Ch’ol, uhuh. (He) speaks really brokenly,(he)
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These code-switched words and phrases do not demonstrate regular or widespread usage in Ch’ol discourse. They are used exclusively in the speech of this particular speaker and in this particular speech event based on the speaker’s personal choices and to allow him to communicate more effectively or more rapidly.

Unlike loaned words, code-switched words and phrases frequently have native equivalents. Though the speaker may know the Ch’ol term, he chooses instead to use the Spanish word in the context of Ch’ol discourse and following Ch’ol grammar. When the speaker uses a word in one language or the other, he indicates a linguistic preference for the word of one language over that of the other during a particular speech event. For example, though the Ch’ol word for shoe is /šañábál/ or /patz’/; Speaker 5 uses the Spanish word /sapato/:

Este...mik mahlel t yat y cho lel, mañik zapato, kok.
Este... mi k-mahlel t yat y cho lel, mañik sapato, kok.
Este...inc A1-vin-inc loc n, neg sapato, n
Well... I went to the cornfield, without shoes, on foot.

The use of most Spanish words that have Ch’ol equivalents should be considered code-switching, with the exception of function words and words pertaining to daily and domestic life, as I have just discussed, since these words represent a switch from the lexicon of one language to that of another.

Discussion

On the most basic level, inserted code-switched words and phrases are distinguished from loanwords on the basis of assimilation: code-switched words and phrases do not demonstrate significant phonological or morphophonemic assimilation or widespread usage by speakers with varying levels of bilingualism. Loanwords rarely have native equivalents, and often are terms that refer to technologies or items of material culture that were introduced to Ch’ol life through contact with Spanish.
Although they both occur through the process of insertion (Muysken 2000), code-switched words and phrases, contrary to loanwords, demonstrate no phonological assimilation and integration into the native Ch’ol lexicon, and are used almost exclusively by bilingual Ch’ols.

Having established that loanwords become integrated parts of native lexicons, I argue that lexical borrowing in Ch’ol is the direct result of intense and prolonged contact with the Spanish language since the colonial period, and with both local ladino culture and the national culture promoted by the Mexican government. The introduction of new items of material culture and new ideologies during the contact period and throughout Mexican history has influenced the Ch’ols both culturally and linguistically, since the incorporation of new items in Ch’ol life creates a need for new vocabulary. I suggest that other loans, such as function words, discourse markers, and other domestic terms, may have been initially used during the contact period as intrasentential code-switching to enhance speaker’s personal status by demonstrating knowledge of the dominant language, Spanish.

I propose that all loanwords begin as a form of intrasentential code-switching. This phenomenon is noted in the use of Spanish “Progress Words.” These words are presently in a liminal state; although they have begun to be incorporated into Ch’ol as they are regularly used by Ch’ol bilinguals, they have not yet become fully integrated loanwords, since they are used exclusively by bilingual speakers and have not yet been adopted by monolingual Ch’ols. Over time, however, as their use becomes more widespread, they will become an integrated part of the Ch’ol lexicon. Monolingual speakers will learn them and use them as a result of their increasing importance in Ch’ol life and their frequent occurrence in the speech of bilinguals.

It has been proposed that loaned words always first occur as insertions, learned by bilingual speakers who then teach them to monolingual speakers (Poplack and Sankoff, 1984:101; Fries and Pike, 1949:39). Borrowed words are transmitted when a bilingual speaker uses them in conversation with a monolingual speaker. The monolingual speaker may then adopt these innovations, and begin to use them himself. I suggest that it is at the moment that monolingual speakers begin using borrowed words that they become loanwords and demonstrate lexical integration. Phonological assimilation and the shift from Spanish pho-
nology to Ch’ol phonology correspond to the integration of these words into Ch’ol lexicon, and this occurs when monolinguals begin to use these words, since monolingual speakers are not able to imitate the Spanish pronunciation of borrowed words as well as bilinguals. It is also during this process of integration and assimilation that loanwords transform to become “native” terms, losing cultural and linguistic associations with their original languages and thereby demonstrating linguistic syncretism. At this point, loanwords are no longer Spanish words, but rather become Ch’ol terms, and are recognized as such by Ch’ol speakers.

As Myers-Scotton (1982) suggests, code-switching may be situationally motivated, depending on the participants involved in the speech event as well as on the context of the speech event itself. Ch’ol-Spanish code-switching may be a conscious and rational choice that speakers make when speaking to other bilinguals in order to demonstrate linguistic solidarity (Myers-Scotton and Bolonyai, 2001:5). The extent of code-switching that one engages in may also be motivated by the speech event itself. At community events where Ch’ols promote their Ch’ol identity, they may be less likely to code-switch than they would be in meetings with governmental agencies, or when talking with bilingual friends and family members. This phenomenon is explained by considering the value associated with speaking Spanish, the socially dominant language. Ch’ols may be more likely to code-switch in situations of contact with representatives of the Mexican government or with other native Spanish speakers in order to gain status from their use of Spanish.

The use of code-switching in this sample may also be dependent on the context in which these narratives were recorded. Since these narratives were given in a formal interview setting, they represent elicited, and not natural, speech (Labov, 1972). The formal nature of the interview setting and the presence of “outgroup” members during the speech event may have influenced the use of code-switching in these narratives, and for this reason, the use of code-switching in this sample may not be reflective of natural speech. Speakers may exhibit less code-switching in natural speech or when speaking to Ch’ols or other “ingroup” members. This problem may be overcome by using exclusively in-group interviewers during future fieldwork.

I also propose that the high degree of code-switching used by the bilingual speakers in this sample is directly related to the topics they were asked to discuss. Since speakers were asked to tell about their own
lives, the fact that they have had extensive contact with Spanish language and ladino cultural institutions motivated them to use more Spanish when presenting their life histories. I do not suggest that this action was a conscious choice by the speakers, but that the subject matter of the narratives lends itself to frequent code-switching between Ch’ol and Spanish.

A speaker’s tendency to code-switch is strongly influenced by the extent and intensity of his contact with the Spanish language and with both local ladino and Mexican national culture. Though all of the Ch’ol bilinguals included in this sample code-switched, the individuals who code-switched more frequently have experienced more contact with ladino culture, or the culture of mestizo populations living in large towns or small cities, or national culture, the culture promoted by the national government, code-switched more frequently. Ch’ol speakers experiencing little outside contact code-switched less frequently than those who have had prolonged contact with Spanish and ladino or national culture. Frequent and intense contact with ladino and national culture not only increases the speaker’s exposure to bilingualism, but also causes the speaker to need to use Spanish more regularly and in more situational contexts. Contrary to the Ch’ol bilinguals, both bilingual ladinos interviewed demonstrated little code-switching. This phenomenon may be explained by the fact that ladinos are not motivated by the prestige associated with Spanish, the dominant language. Future research on the use of code-switching in bilingual ladinos, however, may further illuminate this issue and provide more viable explanations for the absence of code-switching in the discourse of these individuals.

Two of the six Ch’ol bilinguals included in my study exhibited significantly more code-switching in their migration narratives than the other speakers, demonstrating markedly higher degrees of language interference. Their life histories reveal that these speakers have had extensive contact with both ladino and national culture, and as a result, have had more experience speaking Spanish than other Ch’ol bilinguals. I argue that the high levels of code-switching used by these individuals may represent emerging changes in their cultural and linguistic identity.

Speaker 5, a 65 year-old man from the ejido of La Cascada, Chiapas, used assimilated loans more frequently than other speakers, and relied heavily on the use of function words and discourse markers borrowed from Spanish. While he did know Ch’ol numbers, he did not use them
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ecept when specifically asked to count in Ch’ol. This speaker manifested numerous instances of both intersentential and intrasentential code-switching in his speech. In addition to interjecting Spanish words in Ch’ol speech, this speaker often switched codes in mid-sentence, mixing Spanish and Ch’ol without any clear indication that he was switching from one language to the other, an action that may indicate that the switch was not always a conscious choice.

One must consider why Speaker 5 code-switched more frequently than others. His heavy use of code-switching may be explained by the fact that though he lives in a predominantly Ch’ol ejido, he is currently married to a ladina woman who did not speak Ch’ol when they met. She speaks Ch’ol now, but does not speak it with the proficiency of a native. Most of his children and grandchildren do not speak fluent Ch’ol, and as a result, this speaker must use Spanish to communicate with the majority of his own family. I suggest that his use of code-switching is more than mere habit, but reflects changes in his self-perception and linguistic identity, as his life has been strongly molded by ladino culture.

Speaker 7 also code-switched more frequently than other speakers throughout her narrative. This speaker, a 24 year-old woman who currently resides in the town of Tumbalá in the Chiapas highlands, has had extensive contact with ladino and national culture throughout her life. Both intersentential and intrasentential switching were used in her narrative. This speaker used intrasentential switching to fill in words that she did not know in Ch’ol. One interesting aspect of this speaker’s code-switching behavior is seen in reported speech. Throughout her narrative, she reported the speech of others. While reported quotations represent the actual speech act they are relating, they are not necessarily exact representations of the actual utterances of the act, as Koven (2001:517) and many others have pointed out. Even though the phrases this speaker quoted may have been spoken originally in Ch’ol, she always switched to Spanish when reproducing them. This action may indicate that the speaker does not make a conscious distinction between Spanish and Ch’ol when relaying the speech of others, or that she is not aware of the language in which the original utterance was made.

Though Speaker 7 was born in Emiliano Zapata, a small Ch’ol ejido near Tumbalá, she has not lived a “traditional” Ch’ol life. At ten years old, she left home to go to school in Tila, the other large Ch’ol town in the Chiapas highlands. After finishing preparatoria (the equivalent of
high school) there, she returned briefly to Tumbalá before moving to San Cristóbal de las Casas, the large ladino regional center for highland Chiapas, where she lived and studied for several years. Since San Cristóbal is a Spanish-speaking town, Speaker 7 had considerable exposure to both the Spanish language and ladino culture. This speaker has now returned to Tumbalá, where she works as the personal secretary of the presidente municipal, the mayor. Although Tumbalá is a Ch’ol town, her work with the government gives her regular exposure to national culture. In recent years, she has written several poems, four of which were published in the 1999 book, Palabra Conjurada, or Conjured Word (López K’ana et al., 1999). The poems in this book are published in Ch’ol and Spanish, though they follow Spanish poetic norms rather than traditional Ch’ol discourse structure. This speaker also told me that she writes her poems in Spanish first, and later translates them to Ch’ol.

The extensive contact that both Speaker 5 and Speaker 7 have had with ladino and national culture has influenced both their ethnic and linguistic identities. Though Speaker 5 ethnically identifies himself as a Ch’ol, his linguistic identity is strongly affected by the fact that he speaks Spanish regularly with members of his family, many of who do not speak Ch’ol. For this reason, Spanish has become a part of his daily life, as has ladino culture, since his wife is ladina. His free alternation between both Spanish and Ch’ol demonstrates that these factors have strongly affected this speaker. He has experienced changes to his linguistic identity, and no longer identifies himself as solely a Ch’ol speaker. Speaker 7 has also been affected by intensive contact with ladino and national culture, experiencing changes to both her ethnic and linguistic identity. Her work with the government and the fact that she lived and studied in San Cristóbal, a non-indigenous town populated mostly by ladinos and a center of ladino culture, have created changes in both her cultural and linguistic identity. Both national and ladino culture as well as the Spanish language have become defining aspects of this speaker’s life, and her frequent use of code-switching indicates that her linguistic identity is constructed through knowledge of both Spanish and Ch’ol. I suggest that for these two speakers, the high levels of code-switching may be indicative of an emerging dual ethnic and linguistic identity, constructed of elements from both Ch’ol and local ladino culture. Since I base these arguments on the preliminary analysis of a limited data sample, I will conduct additional research on language contact
through extensive interviews on language choice in order to determine speakers’ attitudes towards Ch’ol and Spanish during future extended fieldwork in this region.

Conclusions

Two types of language interference, loanwords and code-switching, have recently been the subject of considerable discussion and research as the result of increased interest in bilingualism. The exact distinction between loanwords and code-switching, however, has remained undefined. My preliminary analysis of lexical borrowing and language interference in Ch’ol has provided insights into the differences between loanwords and code-switching. Intensive language contact between Spanish and Ch’ol has led to extensive influence on Ch’ol. This influence manifests itself in both lexical borrowing and code-switching. Lexical borrowing is present in the speech of all Ch’ol speakers because many Spanish loanwords have become integrated into the Ch’ol lexicon. Code-switching, however, occurs only in the speech of Ch’ol bilinguals.

The study of linguistic integration and language interference in Ch’ol suggests that the key to separating loanwords from code-switching is understanding the process of linguistic assimilation that occurs as the result of language contact. Integration, or lexical borrowing, refers to Spanish words that have been borrowed by Ch’ol, and that have become assimilated into the Ch’ol lexicon, as demonstrated through their incorporation into the native phonological system and their widespread usage throughout the speech of both monolingual and bilingual Ch’ols. Most loanwords of Spanish origin are words that have no Ch’ol translations; those with Ch’ol equivalents were initially adopted to gain status and prestige, and have become integrated over time as synonyms or with slightly altered meanings or functions, as is the case with the Spanish verb pensar, which takes on a new meaning in Ch’ol. I propose that all assimilated loanwords were first used in Ch’ol in intrasentential code-switching, and that over time, they were adopted into the Ch’ol lexicon because of their utility and frequent use in daily life. During the process of integration, loanwords become Ch’ol terms, and are no longer identified by speakers as Spanish words.

Code-switching is dependent on the bilingual ability of the speaker and is marked by the absence of phonological and lexical assimilation. Code-switching includes words and phrases that have not become native
items, and represents a more or less conscious switch from one language to another, dependent on situational context. Ch’ols who have experienced the most frequent and most intense contact with both national and ladino culture and the Spanish language exhibit the highest degree of code-switching. Two Ch’ol bilinguals exhibited higher degrees of code-switching than the other Ch’ol bilinguals, a phenomenon that is explained by the fact that, individually, they have had higher degrees of exposure to both national and ladino culture throughout their lives. These individuals switched freely between Spanish and Ch’ol when telling their life histories. Analysis of code-switching in these individuals suggests an emerging dual cultural and linguistic identity, composed of elements of both Ch’ol and national culture.

I suggest that the use of code-switching in Ch’ol is inextricably related to degree of contact with the Spanish language and with ladino and national culture. Future studies of code-switching should focus on determining the relationship between code-switching and identity, and how code-switching reflects changes in a speaker’s ethnic and linguistic identities. Distinguishing lexical integration from code-switching in the speech of bilingual speakers will allow us to continue exploring the relationship between language and culture and to determine the extent to which situations of language and culture contact influence native peoples, not only in Mesoamerica, but across the world.
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Endnotes

1. Since the data sample we collected in Mexico was limited as a result of the short duration of our field stay, I will further examine language interference and language contact phenomena in the speech of Ch’ol monolinguals during future linguistic fieldwork in this region.
2. In Ch’ol, /h/ represents a voiceless vocoid (Koob 1979:54).
Alternate Routes

3. Used to represent the orthographic \( j \) following Barrutia and Schwegler’s (1994) model.

4. Many early Spanish loans were integrated into Ch’ol in their plural form. For example the word \(/baka/ 'cow' was loaned as the plural \(/wakas/.

5. The shift from \(/t/ to palatalized \(/t\)' occurs exclusively in Ch’ol. Since it is not present in other Ch’olan languages, it is regarded as a late innovation that entered Ch’ol after the end of the Classic Maya Period. Today, this innovation has been dropped from the pronunciation of new Ch’ol words. For this reason, \(/t/ often assimilates to \(/t\)' in early loans, while recent loans do not demonstrate assimilation to \(/t\)' and use \(/t/.
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