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1 Introduction

As a result of the country's geopolitical history, English and Russian have become the two principal non-native linguistic resources in present-day Lithuania. They are exploited by the Lithuanian speech community in a variety of communicative domains, yet with a certain sociodemographic distribution. According to self-reported data from representative large-scale surveys in 2008–2011, access to English is significantly higher among well-educated, socially and economically better established speakers up to their late thirties. Russian is much more accessible to people older than thirty; the command and use of Russian does not indicate social or economic correlation (Vaicekauskienė 2010).
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The demand to learn English is still high in the community and is understandable from the pragmatic and symbolic value of linguistic resources. The issue often arises in the public sociopolitical and cultural debate when discussing the country's prospective orientation away from the Eastern (Soviet, Russian) zone of influence (see Ruzaike 2017). Yet, mastering a foreign language is not always necessary for social identification. Alongside the recognized instrumental value of both languages for the purposes of international communication, Lithuanians have developed a symbolic association of English with progressive Western (and global) culture and life style. The indices of English as the language of younger and prosperous people, Western and global culture, etc. are even more enhanced when setting them against the link Russian has to local older generations who share the sociocultural commonalities of the Soviet era and the post-Soviet bloc.

All these associations create a significant source for the local contextualization of social meanings of the two linguistic resources in informal daily interactions among Lithuanians. When speaking in Lithuanian one may include various single elements from both English and Russian, and research has shown that such language usage is often socially motivated. For instance, adults' mixed workplace discourse containing Russian insertions, slang and swearwords may serve as an index of belonging to a specific community of practice, whereas English elements contribute to the construction of modern professional style and expert identity (Pinkevičienė 2017). Speech mixing also happens independently of command of a language. For instance, certain Russian elements are taken over in the speech of young people who do not know Russian at all due to their indexical charge (association with masculinity, informal style, etc.; Čekuoštytė 2017).

This chapter is thus based on the idea that multilingual resources have a rich potential for identity construction, regardless of whether social meanings are attributed to single varieties or to speech mixing that includes diverse elements from these varieties. We aim to explore the social and stylistic indices of what we call 'mixed speech style' (i.e., situated speaking and writing that draw on various items of English and Russian origin inserted in an otherwise Lithuanian text). In addition to this term the mixing of linguistic resources from different languages in other studies may be referred to as 'mixed code', 'mixed speech', 'mixed speech discourse' and in other ways (see, e.g., Leppänen 2007, 2012; Androuptopoulou 2015; see also chapter “Estonian–English Code Alternation in Fashion Blogs: Structure, Norms and Meaning” by Verschik and Kask in this book). Hence, the focus of this conceptual framework is not on the functions of different language codes or structural characteristics of multilingual speech, but on the social and stylistic meanings cued in the practice of mixing various types of linguistic resources and on the construction of a mixed discourse as a socially meaningful local speech norm.

Empirically, we cover two social and stylistic contexts of in-group communication among Lithuanians and two age groups whose access to Russian and English differs: spoken leisure time interactions among adolescents (Sect. 3) and informal written networking by adults on Facebook, the most popular social site in Lithuania (Sect. 4). Such a contrastive approach allows us to unfold a rich field of indices of the mixed speech style of Lithuanians, in general, and of English and Russian resources, in particular (henceforth we use EN and RU for reference to both the mixed style and to Russian and English constituents of it). Examination of the social meanings of linguistic diversity in situated everyday usages will include the conventionalized social associations of linguistic variants attested in general metalinguistic awareness of the community in order to broaden the interpretative frame for the findings.

2 Theoretical Framework

The construction and use of social associations of linguistic resources, even multilingual ones, is as an integral part of everyday communication. The so-called indexicality principle (Ochs 1993; Silverstein...
2003; Eckert 2008) posits the primacy of local identity work by a community of speakers through which linguistic resources are associated with indexical meanings and thereby with social identities. In daily interactions these associations can be both activated and transformed (see, among others, Moore and Podesva 2009; Pharo et al. 2014). We explore the social meanings of RU and EN in a single ideological plane—the indexical field (Eckert 2008), theorized as a fluid constellation of ideologically related social and stylistic meanings. It is a collective construct that captures both more general and also contextually dependent local meanings of linguistic variables. An indexical field is thus both the basis for and the outcome of interactional identifications since speakers exploit speech variation not just to reassert social values but also to make ideological moves.

In this chapter we focus on how social meanings at the interactional level via stance taking, performance, stylization or voicing of various personae relate to more enduring social types, which may accumulate as social meanings emblematic of the group or the group's style. We study creative uses of EN and RU by which users (re)interpret and establish alignment with the social meanings stereotypically indexed by such forms for their own interactional purposes. Although we primarily analyse the indexical meanings of EN and RU as interaction-based, we also explore these meanings when they become a subject of ideologically charged metalinguistic discourse.

3 Social and Stylistic Meanings of EN and RU in the Speech of Lithuanian Adolescents

Previous corpus analysis of the speech of Vilnius adolescents (50 hours of informal conversations of 10–16-year-old adolescents with peers collected in 2012–2014) has shown that the recurrent insertion of RU and EN is an integral part of adolescents’ speech (Vyšniauskienė 2014). Interactionally, a number of single instances of RU and EN have appeared occurring either as discourse management devices (topic shift, emphasis) or non-emphatic elements:

B1: nu gerai pochui jai niekalp nedažuto nu aš jai ne tiesiai šviesiai pasakiau nu bet jai ta prasme viškši nedažuto ką aš sakiau jo nu jin tokia ėuesta aš taip pačišna u ir pagalvoja ėuesta bionišine viškši nepaga va tai jinai čia da dar iki šiol galvoja kad ten ne aš nežinau ne man tai taip juokinga pyzda

B1: well okay it doesn’t matter [RU swearword] she didn’t realize I didn’t tell her straightforwardly but I mean; she didn’t get it what I was saying yeah; she’s a real [RU slang] I chatted with her and I thought a real [RU slang] blonde [insulting term for a girl who is assumed not to be very smart] she didn’t really get what I meant so I guess [RU slang] she’s still thinking that it wasn’t me I don’t know no it’s so fucking [RU swearword] funny

Regardless of whether separate RU and EN can be ascribed any analytically defensible function, it is the recurrent use of such elements that constructs mixed speech style—an in-group norm of adolescents’ everyday communication—which is socially meaningful as an index of 'youth speech style'. In addition to this generic index of adolescents’ everyday speech, mixed speech may be performatively used in interaction and be associated with the index of playfulness, which, on the one hand, relates to show-offish toughness and masculinity (Sect. 3.1) and, on the other hand, smartness, creativity and fun (Sect. 3.2).

3.1 EN and RU as Indices of Playfully Framed Toughness, Expertise and Boys’ in-Group Style

Toughness and masculinity may be evoked by playful, show-offish use of RU or EN swearwords and RU slang expressions as well as stylized performance of African American Vernacular English (AAVE) also referred

1Here and further on in the chapter the original excerpt is given on the left, the translation is provided in italics on the right and the explanatory notes are given in square brackets. Highlights in bold indicate EN or RU. Morphologically non-integrated EN elements are transcribed according to the English spelling. In Sect. 3 the participants are referred to by symbols—G for a girl, B for a boy, and numbered occasionally.
to as 'hip-hop slang' due to its cultural associations (more on hip-hop slang as an important resource in youth subcultures in Androustoupolou 2004). Such mixed style may occur at the level of single interactional turns, as in (2) and (4), or as a conversational sequence, as in (3):

(2)
B2: suka ateini čia pas jį karočia  
čia kažkur laksto nesuprantu kur  
nu davai bėk tiesiai ir tau pyzda  
miršs esi dabar jau miršs sakau  
miršs keturi haš py trys blet [krit- 
tom abudu j vandenj nu tu kurva  
stovek pabęgs eik tu nachui kurva  
suka tu
B3: blet joptvaimat nafik what a  
fuck blet

(3)
B4: o nachui tau mikrafas  
B5: tai tam nachui eik nachui  
B6: aš negavau  
B5: fuck you bitch  
B4: ir del ko negavai  
B6: ka tu pasakei  
B5: I sorry to you

(4)
B8: jo jo dabar jačuliu iki atšistos  
ant rankų ant kojų ant rankų  
B9: ant rankų šita yeah mother  
fucker you can do this

B8: yeah yeah now he'll bye [farewell to  
somebody leaving] stand on his arms  
legs arms [reference to a video, which  
the boys possibly watch on the smart  
phone]
B9: on his arms to this one yeah mother  
fucker you can do this [hip-hop like  
tonation]

Toughness is playfully constructed by marked use of multiple swear-words: for instance, when engaged in a computer game (example (2)), through enhanced focus on EN in a hip-hop intonation (example (4)) or by playfully exchanging swearwords. In example (3), B4 notices the microphone (attached to the recorder) and asks about it using a RU swearword. B5 does not mitigate his reply (hence does not accommodate the recorder), but continues with the performance by repeating the swearword. B5 directs a swearword to a friend, who does not react, and attempts to outperform himself by swearing in English. The insult is reacted to and B5 mitigates the insult by apologizing, which seems more of an imitation than a true apology, as evidenced by locally constructed EN. The boys overtly show that they are not concerned about the adult scholar who will listen to the recordings and they engage in an explicit demonstration of RU and EN swearwords, thus exploiting the potential crudeness of swearwords for fun and playing around with masculinity. Such insults are not perceived as serious, no speaker leaves the interaction. The knowledge and following of peer group norms when using multiple swearwords is what ties adolescents within a group and indexes masculine peer group member’s status.

As evidenced by the corpus data, performative invocations of AAVE, differently from playfully used RU and EN swearwords, do not trigger follow-up by other speakers; hence, adolescents and their peers do not indulge in complex identity construction but explore the indexical potential of AAVE for the construction of a tough urban adolescent style. The use of AAVE has been illustrated among other communities of practice of European adolescents (e.g., Cutler and Reyneke 2015) show that young Norwegians index their relationship to American hip-hop and the associated social meanings via code switching into AAVE.

A more specific type of mixed speech during gaming sessions among boys constructs an experienced gamer's identity. EN gaming slang signals engagement and expertise in the game, whereas RU swearwords evoke the attribute of roughness (see also (2)):
EN are functional at the interactional level in signalling the role of a player who is monitoring the actions of a game character ((5) and (6)), for describing the words of a game character (I am flying) and thereby affiliating with the character's voice. Active participation in and control of the game is signalled by EN also allowing the boys to create alignment with respect to each other as players and gamers. Successful performance in computer games is a valued resource among boys and RU swearwords add an attribute of toughness in relation to one's role as a player, as shown by non-serious other directed insults in (7). Due to different lexicofunctional types, RU and EN appear to have different indexical potential ('toughness' of swearwords and 'knowledge of the game' of EN computer games slang). The co-occurrence of the elements evokes a tough experienced player identity.

Linguistic performances resorting to RU and EN swearwords appear to be relatively uncommon among girls. The data have revealed very few instances of performative swearing among girls. In a number of cases such performative invocations are mitigated either by metalinguistic comments, such as 'do not swear, otherwise a boy's name will not like you', or an explicit apology (e.g., 'sorry sorry sorry for swearing'). Performatively constructed mixed speech using swearwords appears to be perceived as a marked linguistic practice among girls that may index 'non-femininity'. However, playing around with toughness among boys amounts to a more general index of mixed speech as an 'in-group norm', an index of male solidarity.

3.2 EN as Indices of Smartness and Playfulness

The indices of 'smart', 'knowledgeable' stance, 'fun' and 'entertainment' are interactionally constructed by using EN elements. These social meanings ideologically relate to the symbolic associations of English with modernity and prestige (Vaicekauskienė 2010), the latter evidenced by adolescents' metalinguistic comments on competence and bragging episodes (see (8)):

EN also occur as utterance-framing devices—as concluding remarks, highlighting interactional points similarly to EN on Facebook (see (9)–(12)). In (13) an EN gaming-related phrase is used outside the gaming
context in a highly dynamic interaction as an attention-seeking device for a show-offish, witty demonstration.

(9)
G3: bet tai koks tolkas tipo negi jisai galvoja (9)
kad jisai sukės jom pavydą būdamas su <emergininos vardas> nu tipo aš nesuprantu [...] visiškai nesuprantu no logic

(10)
G4: pala o jeigu aš užsidesiu savo sėtų sijoną jis ilgas visiškai bet still looks better tikrai ne identiška medžiaga

(11)
B15: o man tai čia va bet kas geriausia we not doing matiekos kontras tomorrow

(12)
B16: davai tu imk gerimą arba aš gerimą o kas čia B17: nu niplona fuuu cheap quality

(13)
B18: savžudydės kamikadzė move I'm gonna die B19: kai griovys žiūrėk B18: suicide kamikaze move I'm gonna die
B18: pyzda B19: look what a ditch B18: pyzda aš miriau B18: fuck (RU swearword) I've died
B19: you have one life left B19: fuck (RU swearword) I've died
B18: you have one life left

EN phrases that have evaluative and summarizing functions reinforce the utterance and, via the wider symbolic associations of English, signal an authoritative footing for comments and remarks, which contributes to the interactional stance of smartness.

The use of EN in the mixed speech of Vilnius adolescents is a creative process in which EN is playfully performed for fun and entertainment:

(14)
1. B19: vegetarian kebab six litas what a fuck
2. B20: damn
3. B19: damn vegans you gonna die in apocalypse
4. B20: jo jo bet vegetariskas daugiau negu paprastas
5. su masa
6. B19: damn vegans you so lame
7. B20: vegetariskas kokie confetti with toxins koks
8. eee
9. B19: its fake snow
10. B20: snow fake snow with toxins each of them
11. toxins kids
12. B19: have nowhere to put
13. B20: kids each of them toxins what a fuck
14. [shifts to thinner voice] I am loving it
15. B19: but it's so annoying when there is nothing to do
16. B20: best place to parkour eee vilniaus

Extract (14) illustrates that linguistically mixed speech is a means of bonding, it engages and entertains in-group members as a way of spending time together (see line 15). There is also an attribute of smartness in being able to use English resources. Multiple elements are employed in the construction of mixed speech—that is, swearwords, the famous slogan from McDonald’s’ advertisement in line 14, the quotation you’re gonna die in apocalypse and novel, creatively constructed longer structures (lines 3, 6, 10, 13, 16). The speakers thus engage in an exchange of EN phrases referentially not related, showing appreciation of each
other’s utterance (line 10 as a follow-up to line 9), but recreating the phrases at the same time.

In addition, the dominant position of English in pop and media culture is exploited locally in adolescents’ speech to show off. EN song quotations emerge during interactional pauses as silence-mitigating devices or in moments of high-interactional involvement, not directed to anyone and without an expectation of reply as attention-seeking devices in noisy, highly intense interaction:

(15)

| B21: e pasivelkink <vardas> tokis e I believe it now | B21: hey say hello <boy’s name> [a pause] I believe it now [sing-song intonation] |
| B22: žiūrėkite tegul jis bando tegul jis bando perkirst žiūrėk | B22: just watch let him let him try and cut watch [followed by mock fighting] |

(16)

| G5: žinai high five or rather self five | G5: I know high five or rather self five [hip-hop like intonation] |
| G6: self five you in the face | G6: self five you in the face |
| G5: self five you in the face with a chair by hulk | G5: self five you in the face with a chair by hulk |

(17)

| G7: gilu buvo ane so deep | G7: it was deep wasn’t it so deep |
| G8: so deep I cannot even see | G8: so deep I cannot even see |
| G7: so deep I cannot even sleep | G7: so deep I cannot even sleep |
| G8: ka | G8: what |
| G7: it’s so deep I cannot even sleep | G7: it’s so deep I cannot even sleep |
| G8: kame logika | G8: what’s the logic |
| G7: live in the sunshine swim the sea drink the wild air vau | G7: live in the sunshine swim the sea drink the wild air vau |
| G8: taip pat gili mintis | G8: that’s also a deep thought |

The quotation in (15) occurs during an interactionally loose moment (much moving around, much noise and mock physical as well as verbal fighting). Such an engagement in short moments of fun and entertainment may also turn into a collective pleasurable quoting game (more in Sharp 2007: 232); that is, quotes from media that stimulate the other interlocutor to acknowledge the quote and continue with it. Example

(16) demonstrates collaborative production marked by a hip-hop intonation that serves to enrich conversational activity. Quoting does not extend into a longer episode. This is different from (17) where an EN quotation (line 2) occurs as a reference to something being very deep. G8 asks about logic, but it is not a logical phrase that G7 alludes to but an overt, show-offish demonstration of English.

Differently from RU slang and swearwords which Lithuanian adolescents most likely adopt from their older peers, EN belong to the transnational space, particularly those elements linked to popular culture. The use of EN should not be viewed as a one-directional process of appropriation and repetition, but rather as a creative process in which EN are used, mimicked, and playfully performed in the presence of evaluating peers for fun and entertainment.

4 Social and Stylistic Meanings of EN and RU on Lithuanian Facebook

We continue exploring construction of the style of mixed speech used on Facebook (FB). This part of our investigation is based on interactions among adults who also draw on RU or EN while engaging with opportunities provided by the new space of communication.

Interactions on FB are hybrid and multimodal by nature. Short written exchanges on personal FB accounts are typically structured around initial posts, ‘status updates’, by the owner of the account who addresses the network, his or her so-called FB friends. The participants get involved in the conversation with the poster or with each other by contributing a short comment. Although a dialogue dominates the discourse, monologue performances may be included, particularly in an initial post, yet they are restricted in length. The participants tend to choose an informal speech register, which is characteristic of online interaction, but they are aware of the semi-public nature of FB on which exchanges are seen by all members in the network and can reach other networks (friends’ friends).
Such qualities allow FB to offer multiple possibilities of linguistic expression characteristic of different language genres, styles and modes. FB participants explore linguistic materials for aesthetic and intellectual pleasure, playfully manipulate them for fun, for personal entertainment and in other ways that ‘both replicate and transcend ordinary conversational practices’ (Androustopoulos 2015: 191; cf. Varis and Wang 2011; Deumert 2014). In addition to variants from social styles and dialects of one language a combination of multilingual resources is employed as a medium-driven norm of interaction. Digital media researchers refer to such a speech style as heteroglossic—a notion inspired by the works of Mikhail Bakhtin (Leppänen 2012).

The FB network studied consisted primarily of well-educated, relatively wealthy, socially and politically engaged, liberal and right-wing oriented urban Lithuanian participants in their late thirties and forties—in total, about 300 FB friends of one of the authors of this chapter and their friends. The data were randomly sampled during a more than 3-year period of observation of the network (2013–2016). Activities were observed several times a week whereupon excerpts of discourses including mixed speech were collected. Similarly to the research on adolescents reported in Sect. 3 the focus was specifically on speech mixing. Therefore, single instances of borrowing or swearing inserted into a Lithuanian text were excluded from the sample as was code-switching when participants addressed their non-Lithuanian friends. Notes were taken on the discursive context of the exchanges, including both broader societal and local contextualizations. The investigation did not involve interviewing the participants, but discourse analysis rested heavily on observation of the sociocultural and political views of the participants as well as their overall linguistic behaviour within and outside the network. In a number of cases, interpretations were facilitated by the fact that the majority of the participants were the researcher’s friends or acquaintances outside the network. The data set can be regarded as representative of a variety of constructions of multilingual heteroglossia on the site. Given the external factors (age, education, higher political awareness of the informants) the network’s profile was considered to be particularly appropriate for a contrastive study of the indexical potential of EN and RU.

The following sections will discuss the established formal patterns of mixed in-group style construction across the data set and explore the two dominating general stances of ‘being playful’ and ‘being politically motivated’ including a variety of related social meanings of such style. It has been repeatedly shown by studies of online linguistic practices that resources from global English constitute a significant part of ludic interaction which embed EN in a text in a local language for the construction of a playful style, an in-group code (or anti-authoritarian, counter-culture stance) and performance of a fun, creative and smart persona (see Androustopoulos 2011; Leppänen 2012; Seargent et al. 2012; Zhang 2012; Deumert 2014). Yet mixed digital styles also draw on locally relevant linguistic signs and forms. We shall see that Lithuanian onliners exploit the universal social meaning potential of EN, but at the same time their networked EN is supplemented with and juxtaposed with RU. Hence, our study witnesses the linguistic construction of a stylistic and personal identity that rests on globally and locally inspired indices of EN and RU supposedly specific to Eastern Europeans.

4.1 EN and RU as Indices of Playful, Creative and Anti-Standard in-Group Style

Playfulness has been noted as one of the most characteristic features of online communication since its very beginning (see, among others, Deumert 2014). Even serious matters are presented in a funny or ironic way on the network studied. Lithuanians find EN highly applicable for playful identity work and heteroglossic creativity on FB. EN clearly dominates both RU and other varieties as well as non-standard variants of domestic and foreign origin.

Such remarks as 'I am serious', 'seriously' and similar included in published status updates have been noticed in our data. Overly metacommunicating the intention to be taken seriously by the audience, they are a good indicator of the default playfulness of the discourse.
Examples (18)–(26) illustrate mixed speech in FB posts and comments:

(18)
J.K. Keturių minutes pėškom nuo namų, su awesomeiausia lauko danga ever ir žaidėja-s, kurie stato užtvaras į stiprią gymybos pusę. Visam mieste ant turnikų pilna žmonių. Good.

Four minutes’ walk from home they have the most awesome outdoor court ever and skillful players who make zone defence. The whole town is full of people hanging on rod. Good. [The poster shares satisfaction with the development in his home town]

(19)
g.g. Kodel lietuviams svarb, kad ju vaikams mokykloje būtų destoma lietuvių literatūra? (Patarimai paskaityti gera galimai akademini tekstą su prasimu ir aiškiai tautinės /kultūrinių tapatybės apibrėžimu, ypač jei jis susijęs su literatūra, tautine or otherwise, taip pat more than welcome.)

Why do Lithuanians think it is important to teach their children Lithuanian literature at school? (References to good, as well academic, paper containing a meaningful and clear definition of national/cultural identity, especially if related to literature, national or otherwise, also are more than welcome.) [The poster works on her PhD project and needs advice from her FB friends]

(20)
R.A. Wish I was there my friends. Galia, velnias. Nu nieko, reikės dažniau susibęti.

Wish I was there my friends. It’s a damn shame. Well, we have to meet more frequently. [The commenter regrets not being able to meet his friends for his birthday celebration]

(21)
v.a RIP virtualusis N.C. Ha ha, but I still have you on Skype (O siaip tai žiaurus respekts. Невзврятное, но очевидное.)

RIP virtual N.C. Ha ha, but I still have you on Skype (Anyway, huge respect. It is unbelievable, but obvious.) [inexactly rendered RU idiom] [N.C. decides to close his FB account and stop using FB. The commenter expresses admiration for this decision]

3 The original post or comment is quoted in full (unless indicated by [...]). To ensure the privacy of the participants all personal names of the authors and people referred to are replaced with fictional initials (upper case for males, lower case for females); numbered quotations are extracted from different discourses and unrelated to each other.

(22)
S.P. “pedagogika – sunkus ir atsakin-gas darbas, visur turi dirbti professionalai” – ano i vidno

‘Teaching is a difficult and responsible job, it must be performed by professionals’ – right on [RU idiom, ironic] [The poster expresses an ironic attitude towards the quoted statement by the Education Minister who is considered very unprofessional herself]

(23)
K.A. Taip, būtent, naudojamos hais voit ėmendžing technolodžys.

Aha, exactly, he uses high voice changing technologies. [The commenter engages in a mocking exchange directed at one public person who ostensibly makes anonymous calls but would not be able to use any technology due to his poor technological skills]

(24)
V.J. Гэрай

Good [LT Gerai in Cyrillic] [The commenter expresses satisfaction and approval of a publication by his FB friend]

(25)
G.A. икxedible ???

Incredible [in Cyrillic] [The commenter spells English in Cyrillic echoing a funny post that spells the Lithuanian phrase ‘I am switching to Russian’ in Cyrillic]

(26)
P.K. [...] nesu ir politologiøj os ar sociologijos specialistas, tad visa tai yra mano labai hambl apinijon.

[…] I am not an expert in political science or sociology, so all this is just my very humble opinion [The poster reviews programmes of political parties in connection with the elections]

Heteroglossic practices on FB show that mixed speech style is a deliberate construction and does not depend on the subject of the discourse, be it an observation of the surroundings (as in (18)), critical reflection on various professional or public issues ((19), (22), (23), (26)) or socialization between friends ((20), (21), (24), (25)). This style contains varying numbers of EN (less often RU) of different length (from a word to a
longer lexical unit) and form (original and respelled orthography; grammatically integrated or not) which are inserted into a Lithuanian text in order to achieve the effect of a new, multilingual in-group style, to indicate playfulness and irony, to mitigate the degree of intimacy. Likewise in the oral interactions among adolescents, speech mixing occurs both intra-individually (in a structural fragment—post or comment—by one participant) and at the conversational level (i.e., a post in Lithuanian by one participant might be responded to with a comment in EN or RU or vice versa).

Apart from the Romanization of Cyrillic (as in (22)) for technical reasons since it is not available on a standard keyboard in Lithuania, the informants creatively explore means of graphic expression. Orthographic respellings of EN according to Lithuanian orthography or the use of the Cyrillic script when writing in Lithuanian or in English must be an obvious additional cognitive operation, since the participants are well aware of the authorized norm. In fact, even contributing a funny single respelling in Cyrillic means investing some time to fix the typescript (most likely involving searching for an online Russian keyboard). Hence, the informants deliberately transgress the normative standards of writing (cf. a metalinguistic observation in the data: ‘Now it’s trendy to use Cyrillic—Slavic (Russian)—letters when writing in Lithuanian’). The speech composed of multilingual elements is eye-catching in its anti-standardness, in the purist, ethnolinguistic climate of Lithuania it might even be associated with an anti-authoritarian position. Manipulating the orthographic shapes of linguistic signs contributes to further emphasis on the discursive distinctiveness of the new in-group code. In addition to the general indication of ‘fun’, ‘creative’ and ‘smart’ persona ((24), (25)), such manipulations seem to be particularly indicative of a ‘Do not take me very seriously’, ‘I am joking’, ‘I am ironic’ stance ((23), (26)). It is difficult to know how such manipulations evolve, but they seem to confirm a universal approach to script as a source of joy and play. We have documented written exchanges by Lithuanian school pupils or emails of adults that creatively cross the monolingual boundaries of scripts and orthographies. Androustopoulos (2015: 188–189) describes the practices of trans-scripting, documented in other online communities, where networked jokes include writing one language in the script of another.

In the FB data we also noticed recurrent expressions of emotions by means of EN discourse markers both in an original and often a respelled shape: Jesu/žėsas, oh my God/omigad, nice/nais, cool/had, awesome/shm, to mention just a few. Lithuanian respelling in particular might enhance the general index of joviality and playfulness of the new in-group style.

When EN or RU are tagged at the beginning or particularly at the end of an utterance (as in (18), (20)—(22), (27)), they seem to serve an additional pragmatic function of strategic discourse framing—emphasizing the point of an utterance or engaging in a dialogue. This distinctive formal pattern is very common in the otherwise monolingual FB exchanges—for instance, a comment or a status update in Lithuanian might be ended with an English expression such as No offence, Simple as that, Trust me on this, Old habits die hard, No guts no glory, Prove me wrong, Please advise, No victory without fighting, From zero to hero and others (see also (27)). Being worded in a language other than Lithuanian, such phrasal elements may facilitate a request for attention, a function of written mixed speech styles noted by other researchers as well (see studies of Russian in Rivlina 2015: 449).

| [27] |
| V.D. Ne, Štokesi nepasigydo. Block and forget | You will never cure someone like him. Block and forget [The commenter advises to terminate discussions with one user] |

Given the general high status of English and still insufficient command of it in the Lithuanian community, invocation of English idiomatic expression may bring along an index of being ‘smart’. Russian phrases are few and far between and might, in turn, have a socializing
effect of ‘in-groupness’ originating in the ‘pop-cultural’ inheritance established in people’s speech from the Soviet era. FB participants invoke quotations from popular movies, TV programmes or widespread jokes from the Soviet era such as Sroks įdi, robotas stovė ‘it does not pay to work hard’, Plavaly–znajem ‘I know the matter for sure’ and others (see also (21)). They clearly enhance the general playfulness of networked multilingualism.

Dominating types of RU on FB include slang items and swearwords, commonly associated with tough working-class masculinity and rough, ‘uncultivated’ register (see the stylistic practices of adolescents in Sect. 3). FB participants are well aware of the network’s boundedness in private in-group communication. When transferred to a more public network it is re-contextualized as an index of an assertive authoritative stance and a performance of strong emotion, as seen from the multilingual comment in (28):

(28) K.L. [...] neturiu nieko pries rusija ir nieko už ja tiesiog rusiški issireiksmai skamba tvirčiau ir agresyviau. [...] I have nothing against Russia and nothing for it, it’s just because Russian expressions sound stronger and more aggressive [...] [The commenter explains why he has included RU in his comment]

Stylizing of masculine toughness is clearly nothing more than a part of the general playful identity work on FB. It also exploits other multilingual devices and literacy repertoires, such as mixing features from different scripts and grammars (see (29)–(30)):


The data show that Lithuanian facebers perceive the social network as a space for multilingual expression that allows breaking with the traditional representations of cultural standards of communication in public. Linguistic construction of an FB persona follows its own, anti-mainstream normativity based on a playful and creative approach to language as a tool for social identification. Driven by the need for recognition, this complex identity work involves a significant degree of performative stance taking for the audience and an expectation of approval of its entertainment value. Mixed speech style gains in value as a new norm. Its quality rests on sociolinguistic competences of speech gamers—namely, an ability to acquire and develop particular patterns of mixing Lithuanian with EN and RU as well as to code the mixed speech with social meaning (and decode it). Similar to any natural acquisition of linguistic behaviour, this competence is developed by observing and practising—not by overt instruction. Failure to recognize the indexicality behind heteroglossic practices may trigger irritated evaluations (see (31)–(33)):

(31) D.H. Didomu – aš, budamas lietuvių, [...] turėsiu kada nors tokią privilegiją – skaityti lietuvišką? Be tu visu “jaunimo subkultūros” svetimių [...?] Suprantu, norisi pademonstruoti, kad žinome užsieninį žodžių ir panašiai. [...] Tai gal galima iš vis pervert prie cool tekstų ir virtojų raidžių, p3r311 pr13 sk4161q? Čia gi irgi cool way, pawrotinti kitaip. Interestingly – will I, being a Lithuanian, [...] ever have this privilege of reading in Lithuanian? Without all these foreignisms of “youth subculture” [...] I understand, you want to show off that you know foreign words. [...] Why not switching then to a cool text and using numbers instead of letters? It would be a cool way of writing as well. [The commenter stylizes mixed speech inserting various EN forms and numbers instead of letters]
4.2 EN and RU as Indices of Sociopolitical Stance

Contrary to the less frequent exploitation of RU when indexing a playful speech style and a number of related social meanings, RU seems to play a predominant role as a linguistic index of the sociopolitical stance of informants. Engagement with sociopolitical issues is very common in the data. This may be due, on the one hand, to the profile of participants (who are educated and socially active people) and, on the other hand, to the historical geopolitical sensitivity of Eastern Europeans. There is no doubt that growing exposure of the region to Russia’s information war and Putin’s aggression in Ukraine, which coincided with the period of data collection, have become an important stimulator of sociopolitical discussions on the network. Discursive construction of the sociopolitical indices of RU, albeit not dismissing the generic element of playfulness, are formed particularly in this context.

Contrary to performances of ‘ludic self’ (de Mul, 2005 in Deumert 2014: 23) that are not content sensitive (Sect. 4.1 shows a playful style of mixing can be found in discourses that discuss different matters), linguistic construction of the political stance of RU and EN is inseparable from political reflection and seems particularly to favor critical intellectual performance. This is obvious in the overtly negative assessments of Russia’s imperialist ideology. FB participants insert RU rhetorically when addressing the Russian government and its supporters in Russia (as in (34) and (35)) as well as stylizing Russian propaganda (as in (36)):

Metalinguistic comments make it clear that in-group speech is approached from the normative framework of the protectionist standard language ideology dominating the official language policies in Lithuania and echoed in public discourses of Internet commentators (see Ruzė 2017); the practice therefore is considered illegitimate. As a rule, those who criticize do not really belong to the networking group. They have an outside ‘follower’ rather than a ‘friend’ status in some participants’ networks. Yet, the insiders do not make room for concession. Claims for external regulation are rejected and the observers are reminded that linguistically mixed practices are not intended for those who cannot grasp their social meaning. Such angry ‘righteous’ comments unintentionally highlight and confirm the social and stylistic value of the FB style developed—its autonomy and performativity, ‘in-groupness’, ‘difference’ and ‘anti-standardness’, a degree of ‘smartness’ by being proficient in English, linguistic ‘creativity’, ‘coolness’, ‘trendiness’ and young, cosmopolitan flavour.

Interestingly, the metalinguistic awareness and outright criticism of mixing linguistic resources is mainly directed at EN. This may result not only from the actual predominance of EN for identity construction on FB (revealed by investigations of other Lithuanian networks as well; see Jakelië 2018), but also to the influence of the nationalist metalinguistic discourse in the public media, which has approached EN as a new threat to the Lithuanian identity since the early 1990s (Vaicekauskienë and Šepetys 2018).

The bugs [LT slang ‘pro-Putin Russians’] are worried. You know, dear Eastern neighbours, I find this tube more attractive [RU phrase] than your idol sculptures [The poster reacts to Russian press that accuses Lithuanians for taking down Soviet sculptures from a bridge in Vilnius but leaving a new industrial sculpture of a tube (debated as ugly art)]
A direct link between RU and Russia’s expansionist politics is established in such critical political discourse, and RU is used as an index of an ‘anti-President Putin/Russia’ stance. Obviously, a degree of playful linguistic creativity characteristic of FB discourse might be present even in these politically charged exchanges. For instance, in (36) not only does the entextualization of the Spanish historical slogan no pasaran ‘they shall not pass’ add a humorous association to outright war propaganda determined to stop the attacking enemy, but it also makes a link to the reinterpretation of the communist–fascist/ Nazi/nationalist opposition which is developed in other exchanges. As seen in (37) the denomination ‘fascist’ stylizes a hostile attitude toward Lithuanian people. Together with the label ‘nationalists/Nazis’, it was employed by the communist regime after the occupation of Lithuania to refer to resisting Lithuanians. The transliteration of Lithuanian into Cyrillic (as in (37) and (38)) reinforces the playful tone of the practice of mixing multilingual resources but it simultaneously exploits the additional value of orthographies as cultural representations. In (38) the voicing of a Russian-speaking person is enhanced by reproducing Russian pronunciation in the transliteration of Lithuanian ‘fascist’. In (39) a similar voicing is used indirectly in an ironic invocation of derogatory labels. By coining the playful composite word žydalitofcanacistas ‘Jewish–Lithuanian–Nazi’, in which Lithuanian is made from RU litovc ‘Lithuanians’, the poster stylizes a Russian-speaking voice:

The data show that RU is also employed to deride or refer to Lithuanians who are supposedly influenced by Russian propaganda and thought to (consciously or subconsciously) impede Westernization of the Lithuanian state (see (39)):
The iconic link between Cyrillic and Russianness is distinct in instances of Lithuanian in Cyrillic where the discourse itself does not directly discuss politics. For instance, in one exchange a politician suspected of pro-Russian activities is rhetorically addressed in Cyrillic; reference is made to his publication and the script alone hints at the critical political stance of the FB poster. Even in non-political exchanges, playful insertion of Russian (especially in Cyrillic) may evoke an association with Russia and stimulate a comment (see (28)). The stigma attached to the Russian language and Cyrillic as the expansionist legacy of Soviet socialism during the Soviet and post-Soviet era has been documented in other studies (see Mustajoki 2010: 48; Sebba 2012: 4). Of course, assigning indexical meaning to certain scripts ‘can only be identified within a framework that adequately considers visible language’ (Androustopoulos 2015: 189).

English is clearly opposed to Russian where sociopolitical stances are concerned, but the opposition is mainly established through a meta-linguistic construction of the indices of EN and RU. For instance, speech that incorporates English elements is assigned an index of Westernization of Lithuanian society (see (40) and (41)):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T.K. Siandien kalbėjau su aukštu valstybės tarnautoju, kuris vartojo žodžius okey, hub'as, port'as, svīčas, routeris, spydas ir bullšitas. Ar yra geresnis šalies progreso rodiklis?</th>
<th>Today I spoke to a high state official and in his speech he used words okey, hub, port, switch, router, speed and bullshit. Can you imagine a better indication for the states’ progress?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P.D. […] Smarkiai keitiasi Lietuvos teisėsauga. Savo darbe nuolat matau, kaip jį kriminalinę žalą įtraukia jaunų žmonės, kurie savo darbe naujoja anglišką žargoną, ne rusišką.</td>
<td>[…] The Lithuanian justice system is marked by change. In my daily work I meet many young professionals in criminal intelligence, who use professional slang from English, not from Russian.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data show that mixed (professional) speech is taken as evidence of mastering English and having a connection to the English-speaking world, which establishes a symbolic link to Western democratic values and socioeconomic welfare (see also Ruzaitė 2017 on public discourses of lay-Lithuanians). Playful distancing from Russian (see also (38)), in turn, reveals the associative stigma of Russian to the Soviet past which is exploited in the sociopolitical discourse of the network studied. The data also include comments depicting the qualities and symbols of the Western lifestyle and making various references to the English language.

5 Conclusions

Constituting an integral part of the mixed speech styles of Lithuanians, English and Russian resources appear to be a valuable source to construct social meaning. First and foremost, such mixed speech embeds the universal indexicality of ‘informality’ and ‘in-group identity’, both among adolescents and young and middle-aged adults. For adolescents, in particular, speech mixing that includes repetitive non-emphatic RU slang carries an index of ‘youth speech style’, whereas adults on FB draw on EN insertions to distance themselves from ordinary spoken and written linguistic practices. The general association of English resources with young urban style means, even in the in-group style of networking, that adults may receive the social attribution ‘youthful’, which is echoed in metalinguistic references to mixing with EN as a ‘trendy hipster style’ (a similar index of EN has been noticed in experimental assessments of the speech of adults that incorporates EN elements; see Čekuolytė 2010). The findings from both empirical settings show that construction of in-group membership also involves linking the mixed speech style to the index of ‘anti-normativity’ or ‘anti-standardness’, a playful opposition to the dominant official ideology of language purity and monolingualism. The index emerges either as self-reflection oriented towards an outsider (a scholar collecting data from pupils) or from metalinguistic critique of the ‘new speech trend’ on FB.

Deliberately breaking language rules and norms to construct an innovative, new speech style relates to the intertwined generic indices of ‘creativity’ and ‘playfulness’—the most significant and universal ideological constructs that frame the speech-mixing practices of both
settings studied. A number of connected social meanings such as ‘cool’, ‘trendy’, ‘entertaining’, ‘fun’, ‘ironic’ derive from them. Multilingual manipulations of language forms and performances of these stances and styles may invoke an additional index of ‘smartness’, primarily connected to the possession of sufficient cultural background and linguistic skills to master the style. This is evident in metalinguistic discussions by pupils and adults on the use of English and allows us to draw a link from the local construction of a playful discourse to the universal assignment of prestige and high social value to the English language. It has been noted elsewhere that playing on ‘foreign-languageanness’, English in particular, is one of the most significant trends in current multilingual linguistic creativity (see Rivlina 2015). Interestingly, the only option for RU to be assigned the social meanings ‘trendy’ and ‘smart’ involves transliterating Lithuanian or English into Cyrillic script, something played on in the written discourse of FB. This is very likely due to a sharp reduction in the use of Russian in the Lithuanian sociolinguistic landscape since 1990, which makes rediscovery of the Russian script for the purpose of entertainment appear cool and trendy.

The data show that the more autonomous and dominating position of RU slang and swearwords at both the metalinguistic and micro-interactional level relates to a playful performance of ‘toughness’ and ‘masculinity’. Urban American slang may also carry this social meaning for Lithuanian adolescents, but it is much less used than RU, which—contrary to the mediated origin of EN—is a locally rooted resource, firmly established in all current generations.

Lithuanians also make creative use of the indexical potential of English and Russian in the discursive construction of sociopolitical stances. Naturally, according to our data this was mainly undertaken by adults through the metalinguistic affiliation of EN with an index of ‘progressive Westernness’ as opposed to stylized voicing of ‘regressive and aggressive Russianness’ by means of RU resources. Although the interactions among adolescents in our study did not provide data about the sociopolitical ideologies of young people, their identity work using EN—as experienced participants of the global community of computer gamers or consumers of popular culture—entrench the sociocultural status of English as a mediator of the global life style.

This chapter shows that locally situated social meaning making is inseparable from global ideological processes and geopolitical identifications. Lithuanians’ mixed speech styles with EN and RU are embedded in a larger indexical field of related meanings which is, in turn, rooted in the social, cultural and political history of these two linguistic resources in Lithuania. We hope that our findings can offer a comparative perspective for further studies of the local indexical fields of English and Russian in other Eastern European communities.
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