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INFLECTION IN A BILINGUAL CHILD. A CASE STUDY

(THIS ARTICLE WAS TRANSLATED FROM POLISH BY JAKUB WOSIK)
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Abstract. In the article, the author presents the mutual impacts of Polish and Slovenian on one another in terms of nominal inflection (mainly of nouns and adjectives) and verb inflection in the speech of a bilingual child in his early development, specifically: positive transfer and interferences. She discusses the parallel children’s bilingualism of a boy living in a mixed family, where various strategies of addressing the child were used, mainly the rule “one parent, one language” (mother – Polish, father – Slovenian). The presence of interference in the child’s speech also caused by the language of the environment in which the boy lived, i.e. the Slovenian language, which could become the dominant one. Some of the examples of Marko’s speech presented in the article indicate special linguistic phenomena which existed in his early linguistic development, e.g., code mixing, switching from one language to the other, and translation.

1. INTRODUCTION

The issue of bilingualism has been the focus of many researchers who, depending on their pre-established criteria, defined in their works various types of the phenomenon (e.g., children’s bilingualism, bilingualism of youths, bilingualism of adults, subtractive or additive bilingualism¹, dual-cultural, mono-cultural

* mariazofia.wtorkowska@ff.uni-lj.si, Univerza v Ljubljani, Filozofska fakulteta, Oddelek za slavistiko, Aškerčeva c. 2, 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia.

¹ In the case of subtractive bilingualism impairing the first language, i.e. the minority language, it is considered in negative terms, while additive bilingualism is viewed positively.
or acultural bilingualism\textsuperscript{2}, balanced and full bilingualism\textsuperscript{3}, and symmetric and asymmetric bilingualism\textsuperscript{4}), and proposed somewhat different definitions of bilingualism\textsuperscript{5} and of a bilingual person\textsuperscript{6}. Specialists in children’s bilingualism usually identify simultaneous/parallel bilingualism when a child absorbs two languages from when they are born or before they are three years of age (Kurcz 2000, p. 178) and successive/sequential bilingualism when the process of absorbing the second language begins after a child’s third birthday, once they have become competent in the first language, but before they are 8–10 years of age (Hamers, Blanc 2000, p. 131, as cited in: Mazurkiewicz-Sokołowska 2010).

In this article, I shall present selected results of research into the early language of a bilingual individual, i.e. Marko, my son, a five-year-old boy at the time\textsuperscript{7}, who absorbed in parallel two languages from his birth: Polish, which was used by his mother as her mother tongue, and Slovenian, which in Marko’s early childhood was used by his father and which surrounded Marko’s entire family. Marko became bilingual at home, where two languages were used on a regular basis. Polish was for him a heritage language as he was born and raised outside Poland; so he absorbed it at home in a country where Polish was not the official language (Martowicz 2018, p. 1). In this particular case, the type of bilingualism was simultaneous, i.e. the boy acquired the systems of two languages from his birth (Prebeg-Vilke 1995, pp. 77–86; Snow 2004, p. 480; Štefanjik 2005, p. 19; Marjanovič Umek et al. 2006, pp. 143–144); it was family-based, and involved two Slavic languages: Polish, which belongs to the West Slavic languages, and Slovenian, which belongs to the South Slavic languages. The linguistic material

\textsuperscript{2} Within the mono-cultural bilingualism type, researchers stress the relationship with the first language, in acultural bilingualism with the second language, and dual-cultural bilingualism means immersion in both cultures (Hamers, Blanc 1989, as cited in: Wróblewska-Pawlak 2004).

\textsuperscript{3} Balanced bilingualism exists when the degree of competence in both languages is the same, while full bilingualism exists when linguistic and communicational competences are developed in both languages in speech and writing (Kurcz 2000, p. 176).

\textsuperscript{4} When both languages have an equal status, researchers refer to symmetric bilingualism; otherwise, i.e. when the statuses of the languages do not match, they refer to asymmetric bilingualism (Nalborczyk 2003).

\textsuperscript{5} After (Mazurkiewicz-Sokołowska 2010): bilingualism as (1) proficiency in two languages at the level of a mother tongue (Bloomfield 1933, p. 56), (2) proficiency in the second language at a level enabling one to create in it fully comprehensible utterances (Haugen 1953, p. 7), or (3) interchangeable use of two languages regardless of the level of proficiency in either (Weinreich 1953; Mackey 1956).

\textsuperscript{6} Researchers consider as bilingual persons who are either only to a certain extent (even slight) proficient in more than one language, or whose level of competence in both languages is mostly similar or (nearly) identical. According to Ch. Deprez (1994, p. 21), a bilingual person is anyone who understands and/or speaks on a daily basis and without effort in two languages (as reported in Lipińska 2003, p. 104).

\textsuperscript{7} I have also discussed Marko’s bilingualism in other articles, cf. Wtorkowska 2011, 2012a, 2012b, 2013, 2014.
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was recorded by the mother in a log of the child’s speech. Observation-based data was also used. The analysis of the material was limited for the purposes of this article to the inflection of nominal parts of speech, mainly of nouns and adjectives, and verbal inflection, which indicates the influence of Polish on Slovenian and Slovenian on Polish in terms of nominal and verb forms which in Marko’s case appeared when he was around two\(^8\). The examples presented in the article came from Marko’s early development, i.e. from his birth to when he was three, and applied mainly to erroneous structures produced through a negative inter-linguistic transfer. The strategies of teaching Marko both languages (Kurcz 2000, p. 13) were different, but the person-based strategy was prevalent – the mother spoke to Marko only in Polish, while the father spoke initially in his native tongue, i.e. Bosnian, and later in Slovenian, in which he was proficient. This was accompanied by the time strategy. In some situations, everyone in the child’s environment spoke Polish, while in others in Slovenian, excluding the mother who in those instances spoke to the child in Polish.

Transfer as one of the fundamental notions in the psychology of learning means the use of habits developed when processing one portion of material for another one. Positive transfer facilitates the learning of new material or new skills; negative transfer hinders learning. If two languages are similar, i.e. when they feature many common elements, positive transfer should be greater and the pace of becoming proficient in the second language should be higher; if there are many dissimilar elements, negative transfer is higher (Kurcz 2000, pp. 185–186; Lipińska 2003, pp. 80–84; Marjanovič Umek et al. 2006, pp. 142–143). When Marko was becoming proficient in both languages in parallel, one could observe the influences between their systems.

When discussing individual lexical units, the contexts were also sometimes provided. In many cases, Marko’s utterances constituted mixtures of both languages, Polish and Slovenian, i.e. a kind of linguistic mixing, which means transcending the limits of the norms of each of the contact languages. In that sense, Lipińska considered the term as superior in relation to the terms which refer to phenomena which are the results of the contact of a mother tongue with a target language, though one should remember that in the case I am describing, there existed native bilingualism, i.e. a situation when Marko was simultaneously absorbing two languages from his birth. In the discussed example, I am referring to code switching, i.e. changing a language within a single utterance. Code switching is an active and creative process of including material from both languages a person is proficient in during an act of communication. It consists of quickly “jumping” from one language to the other, which is visible in changing words, phrases or entire sentences (Lipińska 2003, p. 87). Lipińska (2003, p. 90) indicat-

---
8 Specialists agree that the linguistic development of a bilingual child progresses in terms of time in the same way as that of a monolingual child (Meisel 1990).
ed two types of code switching. She referred to the first one as fragmentary as it consists of alternating between languages but in short fragments (portions). It also applies to sporadically introduced words, idioms and sentences. It may be applied intentionally or unintentionally, it may be used by persons who know their mother tongue and the target language very well or by persons whose knowledge of both languages (or just one) is poor or even insufficient. The other type consists of alternating speaking using both languages in considerable portions. This type of code switching, which Lipińska referred to as comprehensive, is rarer. Comprehensive code switching is used by persons who possess a very good command of both languages, adequate to their age. Marko’s code switching was mostly fragmentary, for example in his initial short utterances, e.g.: *ładnie diši* [smells nice] (Polish *ładnie pachnie* / Slovenian *lepo diši*), *wietrzyk piha* [the wind is blowing] (Polish *wietrzyk wieje* / Slovenian *veterček piha*), *tata dela* [daddy’s working] (Polish *tata pracuje* / Slovenian *ata dela*), *szalik nagaja* [scarf bothers] (Polish *szalik dokucza/przeszkadza* / Slovenian *šal nagaja*), *patrz na mene* [look at me] (Polish *patrz na mnie* / Slovenian *glej mene*), *kwiatuszki są lepe* [flowers are pretty] (Polish *kwiatuszki są ladne* / Slovenian *rože so lepe*), *Kaj robisz, mama?* [What are you doing, mum?] (Polish *Co robisz, mama?* / Slovenian *Kaj delaš, mami?*), *hitro jedzie* [car is going fast] (Polish *samochód szybko jedzie* / Slovenian *avto hitro gre*), *deszczyk pada od zunaj* [it’s raining outside] (Polish *deszczyk pada na zewnątrz* / Slovenian *dežek pada od zunaj / dežuje od zunaj*), *jeszcze syropku hočem* [I want more syrup] (Polish *jeszcze syropku chcę* / Slovenian *še sirupa hočem*), *niegrzeczni fantki* [rude boys] (Polish *niegrzeczni chłopcy* / Slovenian *poredni fantki*), or later longer ones, e.g. *Mi že kruli w brzuszku*. (instead of Slovenian *v trebuščku*), *A si imela rojstni dan ali imieniny?* (instead of Slovenian *god*). In Marko’s utterances, there appeared several translations, i.e. examples of using one language alongside the other, which intensified in the later period. The usage of both languages was intended to avoid possible misunderstanding or to check which language a newly met person used, e.g., when the first greeting caused no reaction, Marko greeted his peers in the following progression: *Cześć! – Živijo! – Čao!*, or, at home: *Mama, poglej – spójr!* [Mama, look], or, during a new encounter in the sandpit, the use of the Polish *chłopczyk* [boy] immediately followed by the Slovenian *fantek*, or, in other situations, e.g. – *Cześć chłopczyk. Co robisz?* [Hi boy, what are you doing?] – *Kaj delaš?* / – *Mamica, sem žejen – pić mi się chce, – Cześć policaj! – Živijo policaj! / – Čakal te bom u przyczepy, to znaczy v prikolici. / – No pejt mama – no chodź. Among the reasons for code switching listed by Grosjean (1982, p. 204), two seemed the most justified in Marko’s case, that is: (1) the intention to explain, to clarify by applying the correct (appropriate) and known, according to a user of a language, word or phrase in the better known
language or one which better or more precisely expresses a thought (an object, a phenomenon), and (2) the need to emphasise the gravity of a piece of information or instruction by uttering it in L2, and later repeating (amplifying) it in L1, as Marko, despite the fact that his mother spoke to him in Polish, knew she also understood Slovenian and could speak it freely; Marko often observed and participated in situations when his mother conversed in Slovenian (e.g., discussions with the kindergarten teacher, with the doctor, a salesperson, with children and parents at the playground, etc.) Those two cases could have featured the so-called spontaneous translation (traduction spontanée). That applies to using a word or phrase in both languages (“synonymic” translation occurs in one of those) in order to ensure clarity of expression, being understood well, stressing that which is being said; the term “creative borrowing” (cf. Dulay et al. 1982, p. 114) has a similar meaning, e.g., the interchangeable use of Polish and Slovenian forms in expressions: Marko pridren/grzeczny [Marko well-mannered], Marko našel/znalazl [Marko found], Marko pokvaril/zepsuł [Marko broke], Marko upadł/padel [Marko fell], Marko udaril/uderzyl [Marko hit]; to je guma mami / to jest taka opona [this is a tyre].

2. NOMINAL INFLECTION

At this point, I would like to focus on a few phenomena regarding Marko’s absorption of inflected nominal forms and discuss the reasons for his forming erroneous structures. Masculine nouns, mainly diminutives, which are often formed in Polish by adding the -ek suffix, e.g. kot – kot-ek [kitty], ser – ser-ek [cheese], lose the floating e in the genitive, kotek – kotka, serek – serka. In his early development, Marko used diminutive forms with the floating e and exclusively with the -a suffix, e.g. brzuszek ‘trebušček’ from brzuch [stomach] – Marko nie ma *brzuszečka [Marko does not have tummy] (instead of brzuszka), delfinek ‘delfinček’ from delfin – O, delfinek! Ja nie mam *delfinečka. [Oh, a little dolphin! I don’t have a little dolphin!] (instead of delfinka), kasztanek ‘kostanjček’ from kasztan – Marko nie widzi *kasztančeka [Marko doesn’t see the chestnut] (instead of kasztanka), kotek ‘mucek’ from kot – nie ma *koteka [there is no kitty] (instead of kotka), patyczek ‘paličica’ from patyk – Marko tam rzuca *patyczeka. [Marko there throws stick] (instead of patyczka), serek ‘sirček’ from ser – Marko hočem *serek [instead of serka], soczek ‘socoč’ from sok – jeszcze soczeča hočem meni, (instead of soczku), zobek ‘zobek’ from ząb – Od *zobeka mnie boli paluszek. [My tooth is causing my finger to hurt] (instead of zobka). Also in neutral forms with the root ending in -ek, e.g piasek ‘pesek’ [sand], the names of the characters of children’s story Bolek i Lolek, or in nouns ending in -ec, e.g. widelec ‘vilice’ [fork], Marko initially retained the floating -e in accusative and genitive forms:
*Boleka i Loleka* chcę oglądać [I want to watch Bolek and Lolek] (instead of *Boleka i Lolek*), jeszcze trochę *piaseka* [some more sand] (instead of *piasku*), Marko szuka *widelca* [Marko is looking for fork] (instead of *widelca*). It lasted only briefly and was easy to correct⁹. In the genitive of Polish masculine nouns, there are two parallel endings: -a or -u, the distributions of which are not strictly defined, and in some words there are alternative endings, which means it is possible to use both endings for one word form, e.g. *krawat-a/krawat-u* [a tie]. In all the recorded instances, Marko used the -a ending exclusively, an ending which exists in the majority of genitive forms of masculine Slovenian nouns, cf. Polish *ryż – *ryż-a* [rice] instead of *ryż-u*, *czas – *czas-a* [time] instead of *czas-u*, *sok – *sok-a* [juice] instead of *sok-u*), emulating Slovenian *riž – riž-a*, *čas – čas-a*, *sok – sok-a*.

In the case of Marko there were instances of repeating a noun from an accusative form which he just heard instead of using the correct genitive form which appears in negations, e.g. / – Przecież lubisz *serek* [But you do like cheese]. ‘Saj imaš rad *sirček.*’ / – Nie lubię *serek* [I don’t like cheese]. (instead of *serka*) ‘Ni-mam rad *sirček.* (instead of *sirčeka*), / – Żarty sobie robisz? [Are you kidding me?] ‘Hecăš se?’ / – Nie robię sobie *żarty* [I am not kidding you]. (instead of *żartów*) ‘Ne hecem se.‘, / – Przecież lubisz *pomidory* [But you like tomatoes]. ‘Saj imaš rad paradižnik.’ / – Nie lubię *pomidory* [I don’t like tomatoes]. (instead of *pomi-dorów*) ‘Nimam rad paradižnik,’ (instead of *paradižnika*), and less often a reverse case, i.e. repeating the genitive form when the correct form was the accusative, e.g. / – Nie widziałam *zegarka* [I didn’t see the watch]. ‘Nisem videla uro.’ / – Widziałem *zegarka* [I saw the watch]. (instead of *zegarek*) ‘Videl sem uro. (instead of *uro*).’

In Polish, masculine adjectives take in the nominative plural the ending -y with hard roots, e.g. *mądr-y* ‘pameten’ [smart], *duż-y* ‘velik’ [big], and -i after soft roots, e.g. *tani* ‘poceni’ [cheap] and k, g, e.g. *wielk-i* ‘velik’ [huge], *dług-i* ‘dolg’ [long]. Only a few adjectives have zero inflective endings. In those cases, there sometimes occur inflection root alternations, e.g. *zdrowy* ‘zdravi’ – *zdrow-Ø* ‘zdrav’ [healthy], *gotowy* ‘gotovi’ – *gotów-Ø* ‘gotov’ [ready], *wesoły* ‘veseli’ – *wesol-Ø* ‘vesel’ [happy], *ciekawy* ‘zanimivi’ – *ciekaw-Ø* ‘zanimiv’ [interested], *pełny* ‘polni’ – *pelen-Ø* ‘poh’ [full]. Zero-ending adjective forms fulfil in a sentence the function of the complement, e.g. *jestem zdrowy* ‘sem zdrav’ [I’m healthy], *byłeś wesol* ‘si bil vesel’ [you were happy], *bardź laskaw* ‘bodi milostliv/dober’ [be so good (as to)]. Forms with the endings -y and -i may fulfil the function of the complement: *jestem zdrowy* [I’m healthy], and of an attribute: *zdrowy człowiek* ‘zdrav človek’ [healthy person]. In Slovenian, there are definite and indefinite adjective forms. Marko sometimes created short indefinite forms of Polish adjectives emulating Slovenian ones, e.g. for *brudny* ‘umazan’ [dirty] – *bruden* ‘umazan’ (Zaliva, ker

---

⁹ The phenomenon also sometimes appears in the speech of monolingual children, in their early linguistic development.
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je *bruden* (instead of *umazan – brudny*), for *zapchan ‘zamašen’* (Mama, nos jest *zapchan* [Mama, nose is congested]. (instead of *zapchany*). The area of grammatical gender also included the issue of identically sounding and spelled words in both languages, but which feature different genders. For example, Polish nouns ending in -o, both original and borrowed, are neuter while in Slovenian they can be masculine, e.g. *kino – m ‘kino – n’ [cinema], avio, metro, radio, rondo,* or neuter, e.g. *okno – n ‘okno – n’ [window], oko, uho. Thus, the lexeme auto, identical in both languages, in Marko’s utterances sometimes received Polish and in other instances Slovenian determiners in the masculine gender and the masculine paradigm, e.g. *ten auto, Mogoče tata duž *autów wozil. (as per Slovenian avtov, Polish aut). In adjectives which in dependent cases (apart from the accusative) have an extended root, Marko extended their roots also in the nominative and said: *dreses instead of drevo, drevesa: Pižamki dajejo na *dreses, da se posušijo., To je *dreses., koles instead of kolo, kolesa: *Koles gre, *koles prihaja. *ušes instead of uho, ušesa: Na *ušes moraš dati slušalko – słuchawkę, which, at the same time, changed the gender of the words from neuter to masculine. A similar change in gender was visible in Slovenian nouns ending in -o which do not have an extended root, e.g. *mes instead of meso: Sem jedel *mes in krompir,., *blat instead of blato: O, *blat jest tam., *kril instead of *krilo: Pan Prosiaczek mora imeti *kril, da poleti až do neba10. Similarly, the irregular Polish noun *dzień ‘dan’ [day] in Marko’s early speech was declined regularly, e.g. *w *dzienu [on ... day] instead of w dniu. Emulating Slovenian phrases *podnevi [during the day], *ponoči [at night], Marko created corresponding Polish structures: *po *dzienu (*Po *dzienu *będę spał [I’ll sleep during the day]. Mislim, da *nastepnim *razem bom pa *po *dzienu szedl spać.), *po nocy (*Po nocy *tež *są bajeczki [At night, there are tales, too]).

In his early linguistic development, Marko had trouble with matching gender to undeclinable forms of names ending in -i, e.g., *Nel-i, which he usually declined along the masculine paradigm: *Nel-i – z *Nelijem [with Neli]. A girl’s name *Joilette (Žuljet) also received a masculine ending for some time: Do *Joiletto bi šel. Z *Joiletтом bi šel. – corresponding to masculine hard root nouns with zero inflection ending of the *ričet-Ø type or the colloquial variety of names with extensions, of the Marko – z Markotom, Niko – z Nikotom, Tone – s Tonetom type.

The influences between Polish and Slovenian were visible, e.g., in Marko’s application of Slovenian grammatical rules for Polish words, when he used Slovenian noun inflection endings for Polish nouns, such as the -o ending, which is typical for the accusative of Slovenian feminine nouns as opposed to the Polish -e ending,

---

10 At this point it is worth mentioning that some Slovenian words ending in -o which are neuter, e.g., *okno, vino, are often masculine in the colloquial sloppy variety of Slovenian, e.g., *velik oken, *dober vin/vino.
e.g., Daj mi *konewk-o [Give me the watering can]. (emulating kangiic-o instead of konewk-e), Znam *pajęczyn-o zrobić [I know spider web make]. (emulating pajjovin-o instead of pajęczyn-e), Mama, pozabila si *szaf-o (emulating omar-o instead of szaf-e) zapret. A gremo na *autostrad-o? (emulating avtocest-o instead of autostrad-e), Prinesi mi *kolderk-o. (emulating odej-o instead of kolderk-e).

If a sentence featured a noun and a determining word, e.g., adjective, pronoun or numeral, it usually received a Slovenian ending, cf. Mam *jedn-o zajęt-o ręko [I have one hand occupied]. (emulating Slovenian en-o zaseden-o roko).

A similar situation applied to noun forms of the plural accusative, where instead of a Polish ending, words received the Slovenian ending -e, e.g., Auta imajo *silnik-e (instead of Slovenian motore, Polish silnik-i [engines]). Ne smemo brcati *grzyb-e. (instead of Slovenian gobe, Polish grzyb-ów [mushrooms]). The ending -e is also typical for the plural nominative of Slovenian feminine nouns, which is why Polish nouns of the same gender received the same ending, cf. Dobre *rodzynk-e [good rasins]. (instead of Slovenian rozin-e, Polish rodzynk-i), Lepiej jaz gledam, kje so *choink-e. (instead of Slovenian jelk-e, Polish choink-i), Poglej, take, *wielke dziewczynke. (Slovenian punc-e, Polish dziewczynk-i). The consolidation of those forms was also supported by the identical ending of -e which exists in both Polish and Slovenian adjectives, e.g., Slovenian dobr-e rozin-e and Polish dobr-e rodzynk-i, Slovenian lep-e jelk-e and Polish ladn-e choink-i.

Marko’s speech was influenced considerably by the dual number, retained in Slovenian, which echoed in his utterances. The majority of the traces of the dual could be found in Polish in masculine forms, both of nouns and pronouns, e.g., O, *dwa miška [Look, two teddy bears] (instead of miški). Dosięgnij mi *ta dwa misja [Reach for me those two teddies] (instead of te dwa misie).

I have also identified, though it was only one instance, a change of the gender of a Polish word under the influences of Slovenian, from feminine to masculine: *śrub – instead of śruba [a screw] – emulating Slovenian ‘vijak’ (Res si mówiła – ta deska jest popsuta, ma odkręcony *śrub [Res told me – this board is broken, it has a screw loose]); and of the creation of a feminine form *mojstra from the masculine mojster only by changing the gender and not adding a prefix (Mama, ti tudi si lahko *mojstra. instead of mojstr-ica).

In the case of naming referents using onomatopoeias, a dog in Marko’s language initially received a reference derived from the sound the animal makes, i.e hauch-hau [woof woof] and the masculine paradigm of declension, e.g. Nie dotykaj hauch-haua [Don’t touch the woof woof]. Z hauch-hauem idę [I’m going with the woof woof]. Hauch-hau mnie goni [A woof woof is chasing me]. Grem z hauch-hauem na igrišće, similarly as in the case of a train, i.e. ciuch-ciuch [choo-choo] – z ciuch-ciuchem [with a choo-choo], ciuch-ciuch a nie mam [I don’t have a choo-choo]. In general, Marko referred to a fire-engine and an ambulance as iju-iju [wee woo]. The word as it was the repeated sound produced by emergency vehicles remained,
due to its atypical noun coda of -u, undeclined: Iju-iju jedzie [Wee woo is coming]. A jeszcze będzie iju-iju [A wee woo is coming, too]. Słychać iju-iju [I can hear a wee woo].

3. VERBAL INFLECTION

The influence of Slovenian on Polish was visible in the application of Slovenian grammatical rules to Polish words, the use of Slovenian noun inflection endings for Polish verbs. In the present tense at the discussed age, that transfer was visible usually in first person plural forms, i.e. it consisted of replacing the Polish ending -(e/i/y)my with the Slovenian ending -mo, e.g., *kręcimo się instead of kręcimy się [we’re turning] (Się kręcimo!), where Marko used the possible variant of Slovenian word order with a reflective pronoun at the beginning of the utterance, *mamo instead of mamy [we have], *trzymamo instead of trzymamy [we’re holding], *śpimo instead of śpimy [we’re sleeping], *robimo instead of robimy [we’re doing], *wracamo instead of wracamy [we’re coming back], *zobaczymo instead of zobaczymy [we’ll see].

Also in the case of first person singular verb forms, there appeared instances of usages of the only Slovenian ending, including for negated forms, which probably resulted from an analogous matching with other Polish forms based on a different root, e.g., *bawim się instead of bawię się [I’m playing], *biorem instead of biorę [I’m taking], *chcem instead of chcę [I want], *grabim instead of grabię [I’m raking], *lubim instead of lubię [I like], *łowim instead of łowię [I’m fishing], *myślim instead of myślę [I’m thinking], *patrzym instead of patrzę [I’m looking], *widzim instead of widzę [I see], *zrobin instead of zrobię [I’ll do]. Those forms mainly resulted from analogous matching within a language, Polish in that case. That meant matching within a conjugation group – first person singular forms to forms based on another root and afterwards adding to them the only Slovenian ending, and the Polish parallel (along with -ę ending of first person singular -m. In Polish, there often exist verbs the conjugation of which is based on two roots, e.g. czyścić – czyszczę, czyściisz [to clean – I am cleaning, you are cleaning] ‘čistiti – čistim, čistiš’, musieć – muszę, musisz [must – I must, you must] ‘morati – moram, moraš’. One root is the basis for the first-person singular form: id-ę ‘grem’ and the third person plural form: i-dą ‘gresta/grejo/gredo’. The other root is the basis for other forms, i.e. second- and third-person singular forms: idzi-esz ‘greš’, idzi-e ‘gre’, and first- and second-person plural forms: idzi-emy ‘gresta/gremo’, idzi-eicie ‘gresta/greste’. Sometimes, the infinitive form differs from the two bases on which conjugation is based, e.g. brać – biorę, bierzesz [take – I take, you take] ‘jemati – jemljem, jemlješ’, móc – mogę, możesz [can
– I can, you can] ‘moć – morem, moreš’, \(išć – idę, idziesz\) [go – I am going, you are going] ‘itti – grem, greš’. Since dialogues usually use those two forms, i.e. first and second person singular, the matching depended on the form used in the first question or statement uttered by the mother of the child, e.g., / – Musisz zapytać, czy możesz [You have to ask if you may]. / *– Możem? (instead of mogę [may I]); / – Mogę to zobaczyć? [May I see it?]/ *– Mogiesz (instead of możesz), / – Idziesz? [Are you going?]/ *– Idźiem (instead of idę), / – Czyścisz? [Are you cleaning?]/ *– Czyścim (instead of czyszczę), *zobaczym (instead of zobaczę), *pójdziem (instead of pójdę), / – Co tam bierzesz? [What are you taking there?] / – To *bierzem (instead of biorę), / – Wychodzisz już z wanny? [Are you coming out of the bath-tub yet?]/ – Ja, *wychodzim (instead of wychodzę), / – Trzeba spać. [You need to go to sleep]/ – Marko *spam (instead of śpi), / – Musisz już wstać. [You have to get up now]/ *– Musim wstać (instead of muszę).

Deviations in the remaining personal forms of verbs were rare. Second person singular endings, i.e Polish -sz and Slovenian -š, differ in spelling yet match when spoken [š], cf. masz – imaš, dasz – daš, piszesz – pišeš, płyszasz – płyszaš, mówisz – govoriš. A similar situation applied to third person singular, cf. ma – ima, da – da, pisze – piše, pływa – plava, mówi – govori. Of course, problems of another nature emerged. Those were analogous matchings to other personal forms of verbs where conjugation is based on two different bases, and often the form of the infinitive differs from those two roots. Allow me to use the example of the common verbs of motion, i.e. jechać – jadę, jedziesz [to ride – I’m riding, you’re riding] ‘peljati se – peljem se, pelješ se/iti – grem, greš’, which in Polish is reserved for moving aboard means of transport exclusively, i.e. jechać samo- chodem, pociągiem, autobusem [ride in a car, ride the train, bus] ‘peljati se/iti z avtom, z vlakom, z avtobusom’, and iść – idę, idziesz [to go – I’m going, you’re going] ‘itti – grem, greš’, unlike in Slovenian, which is reserved for moving on foot and other derivative forms, e.g. odjechać, przyjechać, przyjść, dojść [drive away, arrive, come, reach]. Example: in response to the mother’s statement / – Musimy jechać. [We have to ride] / Marko asked: – Tata, zakaj *ne jechasz? instead of jedziesz [riding], or to the mother’s question / – Czy auto już odjechało? [Has the car set off yet?]/ the child responded: Teraz *jecha. instead of jedzie [it is riding], which means Marko created forms based on the root of the infinitive jechać he had just heard. Similar examples of creating the forms of present tense based on the root of past tense appeared among verbs with the -owa- suffix, which in conjugation changed into the -uj- morpheme. Marko responded to the mother’s statement / – Tu może gołąb spacerować. [A pigeon may be walking here] / by saying – Nie, tam niech *spacerowa. [No, let them walk there], and to the mother’s question: / – Będziesz gotować? [Are you going to cook?] / he responded: – Marko *gotowam zupkę [Marko cook soup] or – Nie, oni gotować- ją [No, they are cooking], / – Będziesz malować? [Are you going to draw?] /
– Chmurkę Marko *malowam [Marko draws a cloud], so he used forms based on the root of the infinitive, e.g. *spacerowa instead of spaceruje, without replacing the -owa- morpheme to -uj- in conjugation and while using the Slovenian ending of -m for first person singular.

I identified individual examples of erroneous conjugation in the present tense in one Polish verb: / – Ale hałas jest tutaj. [It’s so noisy in here] / – A co to *hala-si? [What’s making noise?] (instead of halasuje) and one Slovenian: Robot *letu-je (instead of leti).

I did not identify any examples of transferring the Slovenian ending of present tense second person plural -te onto Polish forms with the -(e/i/y)cje ending. I did identify such instances of interference in imperative second person plural forms: *Rozmawiajte! ‘pogovarjajte se’ instead of rozmawiajcie [talk], *Spójrzte! ‘poglejte’ instead of spójrzcie [look].

In one case, Marko added the Slovenian third person plural ending -jo to a Polish verb which in third person plural always has the ending -q: *śmierdzijo instead of śmierdzą [stink] similarly to the Slovenian third person plural verb form smrdijo (Śmieci *śmierdzijo.).

There were instances of using Slovenian verb suffixes for Polish verbs, e.g., *calowati ‘poljubljati’ instead of całować [to kiss], *poszukati ‘poiskati’ instead of poszukać [to seek], *zobaczyti ‘pogledati’ instead of zobaczyć [to see] and of creating infinitive forms based on personal forms, e.g., *bojić się instead of bać się [to be afraid] similarly to bojim se, bojiš se… I did not identify any transfer of the Polish verbal suffix -ć onto Slovenian verbs apart from one instance: lulat – *lulać [to urinate] the form of which was aligned with the existing Polish word lulać meaning ‘spančkati’ [to sleep] and it became the source of a misunderstanding and a pun: questions, requests or statements such as / – Lulaj, Marku. [Marko, go to sleep] / – Będziesz teraz lulać, tak? [You are going to sleep now, right?] / Marko would become upset and say: *Marko nie chcem lulać! [Marko does not want to wee] with the Slovenian meaning of the verb in his mind. Sometimes, for ease of communication, a mixed code was used, e.g. when referring to urinating: Polish siu siu and Slovenian lu lu [wee wee], i.e. siu siu – lu lu.

The influence of the Slovenian grammatical system on the Polish system was also visible in imperative second person singular forms, including negated forms, which in Slovenian often appear with the -i ending while in Polish they take the form of short ending-less forms, e.g., *drapi or *drapaj instead of drap [scratch], *goni instead of goi [chase], *lapi instead of lap [catch], *mówi instead of mówi [speak], *odsuni się instead of odsun się [move away], *pożycz instead of pożycz [lend], *przestani instead of przestań [stop]. Among imperative forms there could also be found ones created erroneously from the infinitive root, e.g. *obraj instead of obierz – obrać [to peel] ‘olupi’, *pinnowaj instead of pilnuj – pilnować [to guard] ‘paziti’, *przygotowaj instead of przygotuj – przygotować
Almost all of the listed examples of imperative forms appeared when earlier the mother had used the infinitive form: – Muszę uprać [I have to wash] – *– Upraj!, – Muszę obrać [I have to peel] – *– Obraj!, Muszę przygotować [I have to prepare] – *– Przygotowaj! The same phenomenon of creating an imperative from infinitive forms also existed in Slovenian: prebrati: *prebraj instead of preberi.

The influence of Polish on Slovenian was visible in the boy’s formulations of past tense forms, which in Polish are not analytical but synthetic, or agglutinative, e.g., zrobić [I made] ‘sem naredila’, szedł [I was walking] ‘sem šel’, dostała [she got] ‘je dobila’, widzieliśmy [we saw] ‘sva videla / smo videli’, etc. I identified the following instances of a transfer of Polish grammatical rules onto Slovenian verbs: *dobili emulating dostalem instead of sem dobil, *našel emulating znalazlaš instead of si našla, *pozabilaš emulating zapomniališa instead of si pozabila, *kakal instead of sem kakal.

In the past tense, there existed visible instances of analogous matching, i.e. creating forms based on the root of a verb which Marko had just heard, e.g., / – Wytrzyj ręce o ręcznik. [Wipe your hands on the towel] / – Marko *wytrzył (instead of wytrzył), / – Nie spadnij! [Don’t fall down!] / – Nie *spadnil (instead of spadlem), / – Proszę, zanieś tam, gdzie było. [Please put it back where it was] / – Już *zanieślem (instead of zaniemle), / – Marko sam wybierz. [Marko will choose himself] / – Już *wybierz (instead of wybraz).

A major influence of Slovenian on Polish was visible in the creation of future tense forms, the structures of which follow different grammatical rules in both languages. In Polish, future tense forms depend on the aspect of a verb; imperfect verbs cause the creation of complex future forms of the auxiliary verb być [to be] in future tense, which is conjugated according to the two different roots będz- and będzi- (będę ‘bom’, będziesz ‘boš’, będzie ‘bo’, będziemy ‘bova/bomo’, będziesz ‘bosta/boste’, będą ‘bosta/bojo’), to which one adds either an infinitive form, e.g., robić [make] or a former gender-specific participle: robil ‘je delal’, robila ‘je delala’, robilo ‘je delalo’; roibili ‘sta delala / so delali’, robily ‘sta delali / so delale’. Forms with an infinitive, i.e. not gender-specific, do not exist in Slovenian: Polish będę robić – Slovenian *bom narediti. Then, the forms with the participle are the same in both languages, cf. Polish będę robil [I will be doing], będzie mówiła [I will say] and Slovenian bom delal, bo govorila, with the major difference that in Slovenian they can be created both from perfective and imperfective verbs: bom delal – bom naredil, bo govorila – bo povedala, while in Polish from imperfective only: będę robil, będzie mówiła, not *będę zrobił, *będzie powiedziała. Only synthetic forms are possible in Polish from perfective verbs; they have the formal appearance of present tense and the meaning of future tense forms. It is worth adding that those differences cause many problems to foreigners who learn Polish. Since in Slovenian it is possible to create complex and simple forms of the
future tense both from perfective and imperfective nouns, e.g. *bom poiskal along poiščem ‘poszukam’ [I will look for], *bom naredil along naredim ‘zrobię’ [I will do], *bom delal ‘będę robil / robić’ [I will do / be doing]. Marko produced mixed analytical forms created from perfective verbs combined with Slovenian forms of the auxiliary verb *biti: *Bom zobaczył instead of zobaczę [I will see], *Bom wszystkie zjadł. instead of zjem [I will eat], Jaz *bom pokazał mamie. instead of pokażę [I will show], Kotlecika *bom upiekał. instead of upiekę [I will bake], Naslednji raz *boš vidziala samolot, instead of zobaczysz [you will see]. / – Proszę, wybierz czekoladkę. [Please, choose a chocolate] / – *Bom wybierzeł instead of wybiorę [I will choose].

I also identified the mixing of Polish and Slovenian forms in future tense structures, with the prevalence of simpler single-syllable Slovenian forms of the auxiliary verb, e.g. *Bom uważał. ‘bom pazil’ instead of będę uważał [I will be careful], Jaz *bom chował, ti *boš szukal. ‘bom skrival, ti boš iskal’ instead of będę chował, będziesz szukać [I will hide, you will seek], Pan *bo krzyczal. ‘bo kričal’ instead of będzie krzyczal [will shout], Ko *bom duży, bom kierowal. ‘bom veliki, bom vozil’ instead of będę duży, będę kierował [I will be big, I will drive].

I also identified one instance which could be considered as a Polish calque in Slovenian, i.e. the word *zaklicaj me ‘pokliiči me’ emulating the Polish form zawołać mnie [call me]. In that form, one might notice a contamination of the Polish prefix za- from za-wołać [call] ‘po-klicati’ and the incorrectly formed imperative form *klicaj, which was based on the root of the infinitive klicati ‘wołać’ [to call] – similarly to prebrati – *prebraj or among Polish examples: uprać [to wash] – *upraj, obrać [to peel] – *obraj.

In the early stage of Marko’s acquisition of both languages, I noticed a short period of his using verb forms without the reflexive się/se, both in the case of Polish verbs, e.g. *trzymam [I am holding] instead of trzymam się [I am holding on], Marko *obudził [Marko woke], bateria *skończyła [battery finished], Mama *obudziła? [Mum woke up?], and in Slovenian verbs, e.g. Marko *bližam instead of bližam se, Marko *ukryl/skril, miza *popsula, and the application of impersonal forms instead of personal forms, e.g., the infinitive: *Przytulać! Mami, przytulać! [Hug! Mummy, hug!], Mami, pridi sem. *Szyszę dati., *Kupkę zrobić Marko [Poo poo do Marko].

### 4. CONCLUSION

Due to the level of diversity and the amount of the collected material, and the extent of the problem area of parallel bilingualism, I focussed on presenting the influences of two grammatical systems of simultaneously acquired languages, i.e. Polish and Slovenian, in terms of nominal inflection (mainly of nouns and ad-
jectives), and verb inflection. Some of the examples of Marko’s speech discussed in the article also indicated a special linguistic phenomenon which accompanied his early linguistic development, code mixing, i.e. introducing into an utterance in one language elements from the other one adapted in terms of form to the grammatical norms of the language of the utterance (Hamers, Blanc 2000, p. 58): *jem *z žličką, code switching, i.e. alternating use of languages in a single utterance while retaining a careful division of the phonetic and phonological systems of each language (Snow 2004, p. 481; Lipińska 2003, pp. 87–92; Cieszyńska 2006, pp. 57–58), and translation: bager – koparka.

The utterances analysed above mainly included texts uttered spontaneously in the Slovenian environment, e.g., in the street, kindergarten, at a playground, which is why they featured increased influence of Slovenian on Polish, particularly in terms of the selection of solutions which were simpler in terms of the system, e.g., the use of -e as the ending of the nominative of plural feminine nouns, e.g. *ładn-e *dziewczynk-e emulating Slovenian *lep-e *punc-e or the exclusive use of -m as the ending of present tense first person singular, e.g., *robim. The matching of Slovenian endings to Polish lexemes occurred in Slovenian utterances in which Marko introduced only individual words. I identified few cases of his using a Slovenian word with a Polish ending, e.g., *Poglej, kako leti z odprtimi *vrat-ami. (instead of vrat-i), *Najrajo se igram z *avt-ami. (instead of z avt-i), *Żołnierze majo *puški. (instead of pušk-e, Polish *pistolet-y [pistols]). The instances of interference were largely caused by the unfavourable position of Polish, which was used on a daily basis only by the mother. It should be stressed, though, that monolingual children also struggle with some of the problems discussed in this article, e.g., declining nouns while retaining the floating e. Slovenian being the language of the surroundings, i.e. kindergarten, peers, and neighbours, and the language used in most situations by the child’s father, became the dominant language and influenced Polish more, which was visible in the instances of interference, though much rarer, emerging in the child’s speech later in his development. It took only a few days’ stay in Poland or an extended time spent exclusively with his mother or remaining in a Polish-speaking environment for Marko to display a huge shift to code switching into Polish. After years have passed, despite the anxiety often experienced by parents who witness the period of their child’s mixing languages and using incorrect forms due to inter-linguistic negative transfer, it becomes clear that it is worth not wavering in rearing a child in bilingualism and thus enriching their life by giving them that opportunity.

11 The influence of the language of the surroundings on interference and its dominant function was discussed by, e.g., V. Požgaj Hadži and S. Kranjc (2001), who studied the case of parallel Slovenian-Croatian bilingualism of a ten-year-old who lived in a Slovenian environment.
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FLEKSJA U DZIECKA DWUJĘZYCZNEGO. STUDIUM PRZYPADKU

Słowa kluczowe: dwujęzyczność dziecięca, dwujęzyczność symultaniczna/równoczesna, język odziedziczony, język polski, język słoweński, transfer pozytywny, transfer negatywny/interferencja

Streszczenie. W artykule przedstawiono wzajemny wpływ między językami – polskim i słoweńskim – w zakresie fleksji imiennej (głównie rzeczownika i przymiotnika) oraz werbalnej w mowie dziecka dwujęzycznego we wczesnym okresie jego rozwoju, a mianowicie transfer pozytywny, jak i interferencje. Jest to przykład dwujęzyczności dziecięcej równoczesnej u chłopca żyjącego w rodzinie mieszanej, w której stosowało się różne strategie zwracania się do dziecka, głównie zasadę „jeden rodzic – jeden język” (matka – język polski, ojciec – język słoweński). Na występowanie w mowie dziecka interferencji miał wpływ również język środowiska, w którym chłopiec żył, w tym przypadku język słoweński, mogący stać się językiem dominującym. Niektóre przedstawione w artykule przykłady mowy Marka wskazują na specyficzne zjawiska językowe, które towarzyszyły jego wczesnemu rozwojowi językowemu, jak mieszanie kodów, przełączanie się z jednego języka na drugi, czy translację.