MIXED ENGLISH-BULGARIAN INSCRIPTIONS IN LOCAL PUBLIC SPACE

Assist. Prof. Dr. Svetlana Atanassova
"St Cyril and St Methodius" University of Veliko Tarnovo (Bulgaria)

Abstract. The article focuses on the process of mixing languages (translanguaging) in the public inscriptions of Veliko Turnovo. There are two main principles that presuppose the occurrence of mixed inscriptions and that structure the local landscape – the presentation-of-self principle and the good-reasons pricniple. In this context translanguaged writing reflects the deliberate manipulation of the features of the two languages – English (in its variety as a global language) and Bulgarian (the local code) to produce hybrid language forms that evoke different connotations. The ethnographic analysis is carried out within the theoretical framework of Linguistic Landscaping Studies with a special focus on the indexability of the material world, code preference and feature analysis.

Keywords: Linguistic Landscape; Translanguaging; Feature Analysis; Literacy

Introduction

The present article focuses on the mixed inscriptions (English and Bulgarian) in the public space of Veliko Turnovo and aims at providing an account of the principles, which govern their production and function from the point of view of linguistic landscaping studies (LLS). Mixed inscriptions emerge as the result of language use and practices referred to as translanguaging and are analysed on the level of linguistic features rather than on the level of named languages. They are the natural response to processes like political dynamics, constant flow of goods and services, mobility, and superdiversity, characterising our modern globalising world. Translanguaged signs are inscribed in and shape the local landscape by the force of these factors turning the inhabitants of a given environment from mere passers-by into social actors. The use of the features of the foreign code in a Bulgarian environment are symbolical but the mixing of the local and the global languages produces richly associative blends evoking multiple interpretations.

1. Monolingual and multilingual signs in the public landscape

Signs in the landscape can be classified according to different criteria but for the present paper a language-based criteria is of primary interest. Public inscriptions

can be monolingual and bilingual or multilingual. Multilingual signs can further be classified as signs written in different languages, which are clearly visible and discernible. Thom Huebner (2009, 78) offers a taxonomy of multilingual signs based on the way of information arrangement. Thus, signs can be duplicating (conveying all the information in two languages), fragmentary and overlapping (only part of the information in one language is rendered in the other languages), and complementary (where two or more languages contain different information and perform different function). There are signs, however, containing mixed inscriptions, for which it is difficult to name the language in which they are written.

Mixing two languages can happen on different linguistic levels and can be the result of different communicative practices. For example, we can have mixtures on the syntactic level (clauses or phrases), on the morphological level, and on the script level. Mixing can be happen in order to compensate for some lack of knowledge, or just the opposite, to manifest a good knowledge of two languages, enabling the language user to manipulate them skillfully and to produce subtle mixtures that produce a desired effect. Such signs are called translanguaged or mixed. Mixed uses symbolise specific values and perform specific functions and language users have various motives for producing them. In the first place, mixed public incriptions can frequently symbolise the aim of the users to show the local landscape as belonging to and being part of the global world. Secondly, they aim at showing originality that will attract the attention of the potential customers (a large number of which will be Bulgarian and monolingual). In the third place, the use of the mixed code will indicate that a certain shop sells only high quality products or that a certain place offers high quality services.

2. Why are signs translanguaged?
2.1. The principles of sociological structuration of the linguistic landcape.
One possible way of explaining the existence of translanguaged signs in the landscape is the approach of the sociological structuration of the landscape, as discussed by E. Ben-Rafael. It throws light on how signs enter the public space and instead of accumulating into a disordered and chaotic miscellany turn the landscape into a structured unit. Ben-Rafael (2009, 44 – 48) discusses four major principles shaping the public landscape, but only two of them will be referred to in the present paper. The first principle is based on the presentation-of-self principle, introduced earlier by E. Goffman (1959/1990). At its basic, the principle is about presenting to the others the most favourable image of oneself. While E. Goffman relates this principle to everyday communication, Ben-Rafael adapts it to explain how it functions in the structuration of the linguistic landscape, which at first glance appears to be chaotic and disordered, but at the same time shows specific order. The self-presentation principle is "possibly *the* major structuring principle of LL as one whole" (Ben Rafael 2009, 45). Following it, public actors (in the role of sign creators) strive to

achieve "their difference" (ibid.). The purpose of achieving "their difference" is to attract the attention of the passers-by and to make them an active and acting party in the linguistic landscape (another group of public actors, including customers and consumers of goods and services). To involve passers-by in public action means to make them behave in a way they probably did not plan to or, perhaps, did not want to. The second important principle is the good-reasons principle (ibid). This principle works in the opposite direction – it aims at respecting the public actors' (of the consumers' group) values, tastes and orientations. According to it, goods and services are presented as responding to the expectations and desires of those who are supposed to consume them.

There are two possible "routes" through which signs can "enter" the landscape. The two possible directions of signs to flow into the landscape are "top-down" and "bottom-up" (Ben-Rafael, 49). Top-down signs flow from public authorities to common citizens. Bottom-up signs emerge from the public (individual actors or companies) and they address the public. The function of top-down signs is informative and they are usually written in the local language, while the function of bottom-up signs is to offer goods and services and they often resort to the use of foreign languages in order to attract the attention of their potential clientele. The author remarks that "the presentation-of-self and good-reasons principles should be of greater importance in bottom-up items than in top-down ones as the latter mostly refer to monopolistic services and need less to identify themselves nor to be preoccupied by competition" (Ben-Rafael, 49).

2.2. Symbolic and indexical functions of signs. A powerful tool to show oneself different and to struggle for attracting customers through satisfying their needs and offering appropriate services is the use of foreign languages. R. Scollon and S. Scollon (2003, 119) comment on two uses of language in the public landscape – indexical and symbolic. A language is said to have indexical use if it indexes a community, within which it is used as a tool for everyday communication. A language may also be said to have symbolic function, if it symbolises something about a foreign country, product, business or service, etc. This is important not so much for the geopolitical or the sociocultural positioning of a code within a community but for the placement of codes within a bilingual or multilingual sign.

Similarly, B. Spolsky (2009, 35) points out that in both public signs and advertisements, using a foreign language at the background of the unmarked local language is not intended to have a communicative, but a symbolic function. Such use usually triggers associations with different cultural stereotypes and that is why in many cases English as the global language occurs worldwide on shop signs, billboards, street advertisements and graffiti. In her study of the use of names in the public space, L. Edelman points out that the use of foreign languages is particularly common in place (shop) names (as is the case here), where the features of a foreign language perform a symbolic function (Edelman 2009, 144).

Most of the mixtures that occur in the public space of Veliko Turnovo are mixtures between English and Bulgarian. The English element in such mixtures is mainly symbolic. Translanguaged instances of foreign language use are not homogeneous. Some of them are the result of insufficient knowledge of the foreign language, while others are the product of deliberate mixtures written with the purpose of achieving a certain effect. The second type are the object of discussion in the present article.

2.3. Code preference. In many areas of the world, English is used to symbolise foreign taste and manners rather than index English-speaking communities. The function of two (or more) languages in a single sign can be expressed by the code preference system. R. Scollon and S. Scollon (2003, 120) explain that "the preferred code is on top, on the left, or in the center and the marginalized code is on the bottom, on the right, or on the margins". The authors also point out that "the code preference should not be assumed to reflect any particular community or ideology in some *a priori* way". (2003, 122) Frequently, English is used to indicate global versus local pattern of choice. Ethnographic research, however, may reveal unexpected patterns of use. In the public inscription that we analyse here (pic. 1), we have a mixed name, which is placed on top of the sign, but is it an English name or a name in English[1]? It is a mixture of features, in which the Latin letters and the English lexical element "soul" constitute the global "aspect" of the name, while the suffix "-nitsa" raises the linguistic features of the local code to the level of the global one.

3. Emplacement and design

3.1. Emplacement and indexability. The problem of counting signs and, respectively of identifying sign boundaries has been discussed by B. Spolski (2009, 32). We assume that a sign in the public space need not be identical with an inscription or with the material body (e. g. the board) on which this inscription is placed. We accept that the guiding principle in identifying a sign's boundaries (which will imply counting it as one single sign) should be the indexable unit for which the sign stands. Following the model of Scollon and Scollon (2003, 2 – 6), the indexable unit will incorporate the producer of the sign, the social relationship (between who produced the sign and who is supposed to read it and react accordingly), the social situation and the physical object (objects) in the world that are involved in the process of communication. Seen from this angle, the sign that we analyse here, will include the following components: the shop inscription on top (Pic. 1 and Pic. 2), the board on the pavement below in front of the shop (Pic. 3) and the inscriptions inside the shop that make one composite sign (Pic. 4 and Pic. 5). The indexable unit behind it will incorporate the shop owners (and the team of people, which they recruited to produce the signs), the potential clientele, the social situation (persuading shoppers to buy things) and the physical setting (the building which houses the shop including part of the pavement in front of it). If any of the

inscriptions that occupy this public space is detached from the indexable unit, it will lose its meaning and function.

3.2. The design of the sign. We offer a detailed description of the sign, which we use as a sample for the discussion. On the top part of the shop (Pic. 1), we see the name of the shop, which is a coined name, combining features of English and Bulgarian:

SOULNITSA

Below the name (Pic. 2) stands an inscription in Bulgarian, which gives clues for the desired interpretation of the name:

магазин СОЛНИЦА вкусове за душата

On the board on the pavement in front of the shop (Pic. 3), we can see some of the products offered to the buyers (only in Bulgarian):

българско агнешко

Inside the shop, on a big black board attached on the wall (Pic. 4) we read the following maxims (only in Bulgarian):

силата на храната е качество, а не количество

(the strength of food comes from its quality and not from its quantity)

and another list of the items (Pic. 5) offered at the grocery (without translation again):

хляб яйца кашкавал
(bread, eggs, yellow cheese)

All these inscriptions constitute a single sign that presents the best image of the shop to the public and both persuades and advises them to buy things there.

The vertical structure has the imaginary form of a pyramid. At the base of the pyramid including the internal area of the shop and the inscriptions on the board in front of it, we see expressions exclusively in Bulgarian. These inscriptions spread over a comparatively large area both inside and outside the shop. They include names of the products sold at the shop, pointing out their Bulgarian origin ("българско агнешко"/Bulgarian lamb) and moralistic expressions like "силата на храната е качество, а не количество (the strength of food comes from its quality and not from its quantity". As the eye goes up the pyramid, we read the Bulgarian inscription "Магазин СОЛНИЦА вкусове за душата". The inscription consists of three parts – a statement of what type of place this is (a shop – "магазин"), the name of the shop (structurally and visually resembling the coined word SOULNITSA), and an expression containing the real message of the inscription (вкусове за душата – "tastes for the soul"). On top of the pyramid stays the word SOULNITSA summarising in itself the meaning of all the inscriptions that occur below – a shop, which sells quality food (locally produced, that nourishes the soul and not the body). The word is neither English nor Bulgarian but combines features of the two languages to generate a richly associative name.

The foreign code, represented as an element of the translanguaged word by its root morpheme is chosen as the preferred code. This cannot be explained by the

fact that it targets foreigners as potential customers. A more realistic account of such a phenomenon is that we are living in a superdiverse world and have to adapt to live in it. There are foreigners living in Bulgaria but they cannot be said to form large homogeneous groups[2]. Therefore, the preference of the foreign code cannot be interpreted as addressing such groups. Having English as the preferred code could be interpreted as fitting the model of global versus local (Scollon and Scollon 2003, 122). However, the "English" word is a mixed word. This word contains features of English, but it also contains features of Bulgarian, whose basic meaning and additional connotations will be difficult to interpret for the foreigners, even though some of them might know Bulgarian. Furthermore, none of the inscriptions situated down the pyramidal layout of the sign contains English translations. All these point to the fact that foreign customers are not the target clientele; they are not excluded, but rather included in the group of potential buyers by the foreign element in the inscription. Surely, an English word will attract the attention of non-Bulgarain speakers and make them potential customers, but a word like "soul" is very unlikely to be informative for an English speaker visiting a grocery shop. The primary function of the foreign root of the word symbolises the high quality of the food sold there, compatible with the food sold at the "global grocery", but Bulgarian in origin as indicated on the pavement board. It shows affiliation with the world quality standards by raising the local products to the level of the global market.

4. Linguistic analysis and feature analysis
4.1. Feature analysis. The word SOULNITSA as an instance of translanguaged writing requires an adequate analysis. Such kind of analysis is the feature analysis, proposed in an article by J. Jørgensen et al. (2011). The authors assume that the term "language" is a sociocultural and ideological abstraction and claim that the study of language as a social practice must adopt a different level of analysis reflecting real life and language use. This is the level of linguistic features. In this framework, we analyse not languages, but features, which are socio-culturally associated with these languages. Language features may be associated with a specific language, but the use of such features cannot be said to count as a language variety. Jørgensen et al. (2011) call this phenomenon "polylanguaging", but other terms are also used to refer to it. J. Blommaert and B. Rampton (2011, 7) note terms like "translanguaging", "crossing" or "heteroglossia". Blommaert and Rampton point out that mixed-language practices stem from the super-diversity of the world that surrounds us and explain that they are the result of not just intercultural differences but of communicative inequality, management of non-shared knowledge, creativity and linguistic profusion (ibid.). M. Georgieva (2011, 102) refers to such hybrid uses of two languages as "globe talk" remarking that they can frequently be the result of unsystematic and unorganized learning Georgieva 2011, 112). Looking at inscriptions as the one quoted above, it is difficult to judge about the level of the knowledge of the writer who produced it.

Moreover, a careful observation will show a subtle and conscious manipulation of the two languages – the native one and the foreign one on several linguistic levels. The mixing of the languages in this particular case does not betray coping with what one does not know but a deliberate exploitation of what one knows with the purpose of achieving a desired effect – to attract the attention of the expected clientele (the self-presentation principle, commented above). I talked to the shop owner and asked about the order of the creation of the inscriptions of the sign. She explained to me that this was a deliberate manipulation of the two languages to achieve a word play. She also pointed out that they started from the mixed expression (from the soulnitsa, soul, tastes for the soul meanings) and then continued with the search for a powerful Bulgarian equivalent of the name.

Such a deliberate and skillful manipulation can be accounted for by the creativity of language use when mixing languages. J. Blommaert and B. Rampton comment:

"There is an emphasis on *creativity* and *linguistic profusion* when social research focuses on non-standard mixed language practices that appear to draw on styles and languages that aren't/are not normally regarded as belonging to the speaker, especially in recreational, artistic and/or oppositional contexts (and often among youth)". (Blommaert and Rampton 2011, 7)

The authors further point out that when people mix languages, they use linguistic features influenced by different ethnic outgroups, new media and popular culture (ibid.). The creativity in our particular case lies in the attempt to appropriate the foreign code – by the use of the Bulgarian suffix, which shapes the word, "SOULNITSA" and makes it look and sound more Bulgarian than English.

We accept that the sociolinguistic analysis of language in use focuses on the level of linguistic features, rather than on the level of language. If we start from here, we will notice that the word SOULNITSA consists of an English root "soul" and a Bulgarian suffix "-nitsa", one of the meanings of which is "a place where an activity is carried out" (its English equivalent is "'s" in expressions like the barber's, the doctor's, the grocer's, where the word 'place' is omitted). Thus, in Bulgarian we have words like МЕСАРНИЦА, КНИЖАРНИЦА, БРЪСНАРНИЦА, meaning "butcher's", "bookshop", and "barber's" respectively. Then there comes the question of how the word "soul" relates to these expressions. The shop which this inscription advertises does not sell souls but food (meat, dairy products, eggs, and bread). The food is of high quality and is sold at high prices; that is why it is supposed to be sold in small quantities, which are supposed to feed not the body but the soul (to transform the material food into spiritual). In short, one of the possible interpretations of the expression is "a shop where food for the soul is sold". The direct translation of the inscription as "душепродавница" or "душевница" in this context is absolutely undesirable and that is why the interpretation "вкусове за душата" is offered below the coined word, revealing the desired message of the name. The interpretation represents successfully the meaning of the coined mixture "soulnitsa" from semantic point of view, but

visually, acoustically and structurally does not resemble it. A substitute name for the shop is offered – магазин „Солница“, in which the Bulgarian word for "salt cellar" has been chosen as a structural and visual substitute for the mixed word "soulnitsa". The root morpheme of the word "soul" is substituted by the word "сол" meaning "salt". The word "сол" and its derivative "солница" have mundane meanings but the associations which they evoke are not irrelevant to the context in which the inscription is emplaced. The associations of the Bulgarian word "сол" are twofold – on the one hand, they are associated with the meaning of "precious" from the expression "солта на живота" (the essence of life; something which is needed in small quantities but without which life cannot go on). The second interpretation is rooted in colloquial expressions "ще ти излезе солено" (you will have to pay too high a price for it) and "солени цени" ("salty prices" meaning "too expensive"). One would expect that the target clientele of the shop is limited, consisting only of people who could afford to shop there. The derivative "солница", however, triggers the opposite connotation – the salt-cellar is usually placed in the middle of the table, where everybody can help themselves. Truly, the shop is open for everybody – people from different social groups go there. The relationship between the word mixture "soulnitsa"/the Bulgarian equivalent "солница" evokes another additional connotation (making an allusion to the history of the process of the production of salt), too. The Bulgarian word for "salt cellar" is pronounced with the stress on the second syllable, while the pronunciation of the translanguaged word "soulnitsa" requires that the stress should fall on the first syllable. Such pronunciation will associate the second interpretation of "soulnitsa" with the Bulgarian word for "saltern" (a kind of a "source" where salt comes from), which, again, implies that salt may be precious (difficult to produce and expensive to buy, at least in the past) but it should reach everyone. We see that the second possible interpretation of this hybrid name transcends the limits of the Bulgarian language and culture, transcends the limits of the local space and present time to blur the root and the suffix into a richly associative blend.

4.2. Globe talk and grassroots literacy. Maria Georgieva (2011, 102, 104 – 107), explains that "globe talk" (a mixture of English and Bulgarian), is not tied to any specific language. It is a specific language practice, which produces new sociolinguistic structures and communicative behaviours. Thus, globe talk can be defined as a complex transcultural social practice that includes various processes like borrowing words, mixing languages, blending and merging of linguistic elements. Moreover, it changes and adapts foreign concepts to local use. The aim of the use of globe talk is in the first place, to use a shared language code in the global discourse, which will serve as a mark of difference from local traditions and as a claim of adherence to world values. This hybrid mode of communication, no longer tied to any particular language or culture, transcends linguistic, cultural, and spatial boundaries to become part of a supracultural discursive practice, which can be observed in different spheres of public life. We can observe that this transcultural linguistic practice is

inscribed in the local public space, too. M. Georgieva explains that the audience of hybrid (translanguaged) texts consists of predominantly local people (2011, 108). This audience is monolingual and the large part of it possesses some knowledge of English, which the author describes as low-level, unorganised and fragmentary. However, the inscription emplaced in the public space that is analysed here does not betray a superficial and unorganized form of knowledge. This is an instance of a consciously and carefully performed mixture of the two languages carried out with the perfect awareness of achieving a strong and desired effect. It clearly indicates the aspiration of the sign maker not only to adapt and incorporate the features of the foreign language in the everyday use of the local user but also to produce a coinage that will evoke multiple and complex interpretations in the public.

The variety of English used in this environment – global English is a form of the language, which is a denationalized and deterritorialised. In addition, M. Georgieva (2011, 103) remarks that its use in the local context is not typical of a particular socio-economic elite but spreads across different classes and social groups. The mixed practices discussed by Georgieva show that by mixing linguistic expressions (English and Bulgarian), people of various social background manifest affiliation to world values and practices. Some hybrid word coinages, observed in the local linguistic landscape show that the selection and utilisation of the elements from the dominant language need not always be fragmentary and unorganised. They can be carefully and creatively selected and adopted. Their function is two-fold – on the one hand, such coinages work as an efficient marketing tool (following the two principles discussed by Ben-Rafael and mentioned earlier in this paper), while on the other hand, their use leads to rescaling and recontextualisation of the local landscape. The effect of such recontextualisation is that a particular social entity (a village, an urban centre, in our case a local grocery) is positioned in new relations with other scales (in our case "the global grocery"). This recontextualisation is achieved through merging, mixing and crossing of global and local entities. The imported words and structures have different indexical loads and their effect and interpretation depends on who uses them and for what purposes. Global elements, which are external to the system, are never fully integrated in it. Thus, the linguistic mixtures acquire the status of hybrid structures and the result of a process called "glocalisation", a specific way of using globe talk (Georgieva 131 – 133). Globe talk users need not be true bilinguals and the foreign language they use has a highly symbolic value.

Another approach to account for the use of such translanguaged forms of writing is the model of analysis called "grassroots literacy", introduced by J. Blommaert (2007). The products of grassroots literacy are heterographic texts that defy the rules of orthography and grammar. In the public landscape, heterographic inscriptions are a recurrent phenomenon and they can be analysed as the result of situated and contextualised practices (Blommaert 2007, 18 – 25). A text always shows traces regarding its histories of production and interpretation and its deviations from the

normative forms of writing can be justified if we regard it as a socially and culturally organised "technology for the production of Selves operating within locally systemic conditions" (Blommaert 2007, 225). Thus, heterographic (translanguaged or hybrid) writing is a particular form of writing which occurs freely within the local linguistic landscape. This is not judged as being substandard or incorrect as it would be if it occurred in a different type of context, for example, educational. The justification for the use of such forms of writing in the landscape will be the presentation-of-self principle (to present oneself as different from the local traditions in order to attract attention) and the good reasons principle (to work for the benefit of the customers). Thus, mixed inscriptions in the public space are a specific cultural product and can be regarded as a legitimate form of public writing discourse.

Coined and hybrid names and expressions, which are manifestations of grassroots writing produce voice. To produce voice means "to represent the particular ways – often deviant from hegemonic norms – in which subjects produce meanings" (Blommaert 2007, 23). The analysis of voice is the analysis of the particular ways in which people organise the different communicative resources available to them to produce specific meanings. If we remove the name "Soulnitsa" from the present context and place it in a different locus, it will lose "its voice" (Blommaert 2007, 11). Despite the elements of the global code (English) it contains, it will not function in the same way neither in a native speaking environment, nor in another place in the world where English is also used as the global code. The "soul" element will be recognised as English but its function in the name of a grocery shop will be puzzling for anyone who is not familiar with the grammatical meaning of the suffix "-nitsa" and its presence in the local landscape with the meaning of "place, shop".

5. Recontextualisation and rescaling

In his study of the sociolinguistics of globalisation, J. Blommaert introduces the concept of scale as a metaphor by which we can imagine the moves of people or messages through a space, which is filled by codes, norms and expectations (Blommaert 2010, 32). The term "vernacular globalization" (similar to what Georgieva calls "glocalisation") is used to refer to forms of globalisation that contribute to new forms of locality (ibid.). The scale metaphor suggests spatial images and therefore, we can adopt for the needs of the present analysis a vertical image of space. Space is stratified and power-invested: it reflects a layered and stratified model of society as a frame for the interpretation of such phenomenon (ibid). Thus, in the design of the SOULNITSA sign we can see the global elements dominating the local ones, but at the same time, the vernacular elements reshaping and appropriating the foreign. Language is related to social space through two main axes that are labeled "territorialisation" and "deterritorialisation" (Blommaert 2010, 45). "Territorialisation" implies "the perception and attribution of values to language as a local phenomenon" (ibid.), as something, which "ties people to local communities and spaces" (ibid., 46). On the other hand, "deterritorialisation"

implies "the perception and attribution of values to language as something which does not belong to one locality but which organizes translocal trajectories and wider spaces" (Blommaert 2010, 46). The author calls such newly projected trajectories "scale jumps" (ibid.) and further writes that "second or other languages (L2) as well as lingua francas and diaspora varieties, standardized varieties and literacy are seen as 'deterritorialized language' that does not exclusively belong to one place" (ibid.). In the present landscape, the deterritorialsied elements of the global language find a new territory for emplacement. Due to processes like vernacular globalisation or glocalisation, they become territorialised, that is they become adopted and adapted as a foreign code, and produce voice in the local landscape.

Following Blommaert's model of the sociolinguitics of globalisation, M. Prinsloo and Lara-S. Krause (2019) support the idea that language cannot be reduced to a denotational code only, consisting of a grammar and lexicon; it always implies the presence of the connotational and indexical components of meaning. These components, in turn are rooted in the socio-political values and cultural beliefs of the language users who always express themselves as people performing actions and activities that are clearly recognisable as socially-situated and culturally determined. Seen from the scalar perspective, linguistic repertoires can also be assumed to be layered and stratified phenomena, operating at different scale levels. Thus, some of them are productive at the global level, others operate regionally, and still others are effective only locally. In our case, English works as a specific variety of the global language, producing locally engendered mixtures of English and Bulgarian. The scale models allows each context (local, national, and global) to create its own "orders of indexicality" (Blommaert 2012, 16), by which language users ascribe meanings and values to the different codes they use.

This is a natural process because people will start talking about the shop and will have to pronounce its name in their daily conversations but which kind of pronunciation[3] will become popular will depend on what indexical value people will attribute the coined word and to the indexable unit that lies behind it. In other words, whatever "outside" elements enter the spatial entity, the processes of recontextualisation will involve not only accepting, but also reacting and responding to external elements and discourses.

Conclusion

Mixing languages is a natural outcome and response to the processes of globalisation around the world. The public landscape is a sphere where it occurs as a local form of writing and a recognised form of discourse. Translanguaged writing in local public space emerges as the result of sociological factors, political forces, and individual creativity and as a hybrid form of writing is believed to stay outside the systems of named languages. Mixed inscriptions are produced mainly to be seen on public signs, symbolising and advertising world values, serving social functions and performing

marketing strategies. Some of these inscriptions may not be long lasting and will soon disappear and die away. Others, however, may stay and may start circulating in the everyday communication of the local community. Whether they will "enter" the named language as full-fledged entities or not is a problem to be observed, studied and analysed.

Appendix

Pic. 1

Pic. 2

Pic. 3

Pic. 4

Pic. 5

NOTES

1. L. Edelman (2009, 146) notes the subtle distinction that can emerge when we use foreign names; thus we can have a difference between, for example, a Chinese proper name and a proper name in Chinese.

2. In his study of superdiversity, Steven Vertovec (2006) explains that immigrants no longer form large and strong homogeneous groups in the country they have chosen to live but are dispersed throughout the territory of their new environment.

3. "Сóлница", "солнѝца" or even a third pronunciation "сóулница" that would make the new word not only look but also sound "globally".

REFERENCES

BEN-RAFAEL, E., 2009. A Sociological Approach to the Study of Linguistic Landscape. In: *Linguistic Landscape: Expanding the Scenery*. Elana Shohamy and Durk Gorter (Eds.). New York: Routlege, 40 – 54.

BLOMMAERT, J., 2012. *Chronicles of Complexity: Ethnography, Superdiversity and Linguistic Landscapes.* Accessed 3 June 2022. At https://www.researchgate.net/publication/265850728_Ethnography_ Superdiversity_and_Linguistic_Landscapes_Chronicles_of_ Complexity.

BLOMMAERT, J., 2010. *The Sociolinguistics of Globalisation.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

BLOMMAERT, J., 2007. *Grassroots Literacy: Writing, Voice and Identity in Central Africa.* (Manuscript) At https://www.researchgate.net/ publication/228892589_Grassroots_Literacy_Writing_Identity_and_ Voice_in_Central_Africa Accesses 3 June 2022

BLOMMAERT, J., RAMPTON, B., 2011. Language and Superdiversity. In *Diversities 13 (2).* Accessed 5 June 2022. At https://www.researchgate. net/publication/254777452_Language_and_Superdiversity, 1 – 21.

Edelman, Loulou, 2009. What's in a name? Classification of Proper Names by Language. In: Elana Shohamy and Durk Gorter (Eds.). *Linguistic Landscape: Expanding the Scenery*. New York: Routlege, 141 – 154.

GEORGIEVA, M., 2011. *Global English in Bulgarian Context.* Varna: Silueti Publishing House

Goffman, Erving, 1959/1990. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. London: Penguin

HUEBNER, T., 2009. A Framework for the Linguistic Analysis of the Linguistic Landscapes. In: Elana Shohamy and Durk Gorter (Eds.). *Linguistic Landscape: Expanding the Scenery*. New York: Routlege, 70 – 87.

JØRGENSEN, J. N., KARREBAEK, M. S., MADSEN, L. M., MØLLER, J. S., 2011. Polylanguaging in Superdiversity. In *Diversities 13 (2)*. Accessed 5 June 2022. At https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000214781/PDF/214772eng.pdf.multi.nameddest=214781, 23 – 37.

PRINSLOO, M., KRAUSE, L. S., 2019. Translanguaging, Place and Complexity. In: *Language and Education 33 (2)*. Routlege: Taylor and Francis. Accessed 2 June 2022. At https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09500782.2018.1516778?journalCode=rlae20, 159 – 173.

SCOLLON, R., Scollon, S. W., 2003. *Disourses in Place: Language in the Material World.* London: Routlege

SPOLSKI, B., 2009. Prolegomena to a Sociolinguistic Theory of Public Signage. In: Elana Shohamy and Durk Gorter (Eds.). *Linguistic Landscape: Expanding the Scenery*. New York: Routlege, 25 – 39.

VERTOVEC, S., 2006. The Emergence of Super-Diversity in Britain. In: *Center on Migration, Policy and Society, Working Paper 25*. Accessed 3 June 2022. At https://www.compas.ox.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/WP-2006-025-Vertovec_Super-Diversity_Britain.pdf

✉ **Dr. Svetlana Atanassova, Assist. Prof.**
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-3687-2324
"St Cyril and St Methodius" University of Veliko Tarnovo
Veliko Tarnovo, Bulgaria
E-mail: s.atanasova@ts.uni-vt.bg