

CODE-SWITCHING AND INDEXICALITY IN *BORAT* *SUBSEQUENT MOVIEFILM (2020)*

Alexandrina Ugrenova

Sofia University St. Kliment Ohridski, Bulgaria

E-mail: alexshort819@gmail.com

ПРЕВКЛЮЧВАНЕ НА ЕЗИКОВИ КОДОВЕ И ИНДЕКСИКАЛНОСТ ВЪВ ФИЛМА
„БОРАТ 2“ (2020)

Александрина Угренова

Софийски университет „Св. Климент Охридски“, България

Abstract: This article discusses *Borat Subsequent Moviefilm*, more precisely, the linguistic repertoire of one of the main characters, viz. Tutar. In the movie, there are three main linguistic codes: English, Bulgarian and Hebrew. The main characters, Borat and his daughter Tutar, use different languages in their conversations – Borat speaks Hebrew, while Tutar speaks Bulgarian. Also, both of them use English fluently. In this respect, I intend to focus on Tutar’s use of both Bulgarian and English and what each code represents. The indexical meanings of the linguistic choices Tutar makes allow us to arrive at fascinating conclusions about the complexity of her identity as well as the reasons she code-switches.

Keywords: *Borat Subsequent Moviefilm*, code-switching, multilingualism, indexicality, identity.

Резюме: Настоящата статия разглежда „Борат 2“, по-специално лингвистичния репертоар на един от главните герои, а именно Тутар. Във филма има три основни лингвистични кода: английски, български и иврит. Главните герои Борат и Тутар използват различни езици в разговорите си – Борат говори иврит, докато Тутар говори български. Също така и двамата герои говорят английски свободно. В този ред на мисли, възнамерявам да се фокусирам върху употребата на български и английски от страна на Тутар и какво символизира двата кода. Индексикалните значения, произлизащи от лингвистичните решения на Тутар, ни позволяват да стигнем до интересни заключения относно сложността на нейната идентичност, както и причината, поради която превключва на двата езика.

Ключови думи: „Борат 2“, превключване на езиков код, мултилингвизъм, индексикалност, идентичност.

Introduction

Today's modern world is marked by diversity owing to the great changes in terms of technology and migration. Naturally, the impact of social media and mobility has made it possible to connect with people from around the world and with different languages. In a world where change is the only constant and people and languages seem to move more freely than ever, the terms *multilingualism* and *code-switching* are essentially brought into the spotlight. Indeed, the use of more than one language and the inevitable switches people make from one language to another are integral features of modernity, which also hold fascinating and important indexical implications. Languages, in general, are not simply a tool for communication; they point to different layers of people's identities (Blommaert 2005), allowing researchers to come to interesting interpretations.

Summary

Borat Subsequent Moviefilm is a 2020 comedy movie. Directed by Jason Woliner, the movie stars Sacha Baron Cohen, who returns as the fictional journalist Borat Sagdiyev from Kazakhstan, and Maria Bakalova as his daughter, Tutar. Tutar is to be delivered as a bride to former vice president Mike Pence during the Covid-19 pandemic and the 2020 presidential election. While the movie portrays plenty of absurd situations, it essentially offers considerable insight into American society. The movie also explores the complex father-daughter relationship between the two main characters as well as Tutar's personal, psychological and professional development.

Theoretical Background

The increase in mobility and migration after the 1990s impacted the spread of multilingualism (Blommaert & Rampton 2011: 3-4). In this context, the term *multilingualism* is “an umbrella term for the use of two (bilingualism) or more languages” (Bleichenbacher 2008: 7). Like other sociolinguists, Bleichenbacher uses the terms first language (L1) and second language (L2) rather than native and foreign language (ibid., 10-11) for the sake of linguistic

egalitarianism. A person's first language is the linguistic code they use more fluently than any other language (ibid., 10). Likewise, if a person is equally fluent in more than one code, their first language is considered to be the one which they are ethnically, nationally or culturally affiliated to (ibid., 10-11). Pursuing this further, a second language is considered to be the one that is acquired through learning. Therefore, both L1 and L2 form a part of a person's linguistic repertoire, which is considered to be "the totality of languages available to or used by any given person" (Bleichenbacher 2008: 10). From this, we could conclude that the number of languages one is fluent in provides one with the opportunity to select different linguistic codes for different situations. In this respect, our language choice is impacted by extralinguistic features (ibid., 12). Blom and Gumperz (1986: 421) outline three of the most prominent ones: the participants in a communicative situation, the speakers' surroundings and the topics which are discussed (as cited in Bleichenbacher (2008: 12)).

In order to illustrate this more clearly, imagine that you are having dinner with your family. It is very likely that you will use the language that your family members are using, as a different linguistic code would naturally seem inappropriate. Similarly, if a politician is speaking in a government building, they are likely to use the language of their countrymen and countrywomen due to the cultural importance the environment has. Also, since they are addressing the entire country, their language choice is also impacted by the addresses. From this, we could conclude that more than one extralinguistic feature could affect the selection of a linguistic code.

Pursuing this further, the diversity in one's linguistic repertoire gives one the opportunity to switch between languages (Bleichenbacher 2008: 13). This process is known as *code-switching*, which is also guided by extralinguistic factors (ibid.). For example, two Erasmus+ participants from the same country are likely to lead a conversation in their first language, provided they are alone. However, the arrival of a new participant from another country would naturally make the former two speakers switch to another linguistic code, more precisely English, so that the newcomer would not feel excluded. From this, we could conclude that code-switching could also be used as a positive politeness strategy (Brown & Levinson 1987), which creates a sense of solidarity and inclusivity. According to Blom and Gumperz (1986: 424 ff), this kind of code-switching is an example of *situational code-switching*, since it marks a change in the communicative context (as cited in Bleichenbacher (2008: 13)). Conversely, Blom and

Gumperz (1986: 425) discuss *metaphorical code-switching*, where a speaker can choose to switch between languages to “add a special social meaning” (as cited in Bleichenbacher (2008: 13)). For example, a speaker may choose to switch to English to signal his/her affiliation with a particular age group as, more often than not, young people tend to code-switch. Additionally, the switch between languages could render a speaker more authoritative, especially if one of the two or more languages is more internationally prestigious (Bleichenbacher 2008: 13).

Code-mixing is related to code-switching. Code-mixing is essentially the mixing of two or more languages into a single utterance (Thara & Poornachandran 2018: 2382). Pursuing this further, according to Auer (1999), code-mixing is a more intensive form of code-switching (as cited in Bleichenbacher (2008: 13-14)).

The use of code-switching naturally prompts us to consider the concept of indexicality. Utterances can disclose a lot of non-linguistic information about speakers (Blommaert 2005: 11). Therefore, the linguistic code or style people use can index their gender, class, educational background, etc. (ibid., 11). As stated, speakers can decide to code-switch into another language or even style if they want to appear more authoritative or if they wish to establish a sense of solidarity. Consequently, it is important to consider the reason behind the specific linguistic code in addition to the literal meaning of the utterance (Blommaert & Rampton 2011). Pursuing this further, Myers-Scotton (1988: 152) states that “all linguistic code choices are indexical of a set of rights and obligations holding between participants in the conversational exchange” (as cited in Gafaranga (2007: 105)). This is part of what Myers-Scotton refers to as the *Markedness Model* (1983, 1993, 1998, as cited in Myers-Scotton & Bolonyai (2001: 7)). Myers-Scotton further states,

The Markedness Model [...] depends on the addition of a speaker's 'markedness metric' to an enlarged conception of linguistic competence. This metric is part of the innate cognitive faculty of all humans. It enables speakers to assess all code choices as more or less unmarked or marked for the exchange type in which they occur. (1993b: 79-80, as cited in Gafaranga (2007: 107))

The definition above draws our attention to two important points, namely the difference between unmarked and marked code choices and the ‘markedness metric’. I will first touch upon

the former. An unmarked code choice refers to the linguistic code, which conforms to the “script”, i.e. it is conventional and expected, whereas a marked language choice refers to the code, which is unconventional and unexpected (Myers-Scotton (1993b: 89), as cited in Gafaranga (2007: 108)). Again, the use of a marked linguistic code signals a speaker’s wish to outline a change in the communicative context (Gafaranga 2007). Additionally, speakers may also use a marked linguistic code to reinforce a part of their identity or to sound firmer and more authoritative (ibid.). The choice between marked and unmarked code choices naturally reinforces the importance of speaker agency (ibid.).

The *markedness metric*, as discussed in the definition above, pertains to speakers’ inherent ability to differentiate between linguistic codes (Myers-Scotton (1993b: 79-80), as cited in Gafaranga (2007: 107)). In addition to this, the markedness metric is applied to social contexts (Myers-Scotton (1999: 1216), as cited in Gafaranga (2007: 107)). Consequently, it “enables speakers to sense the degree to which alternative linguistic choices are unmarked or marked for a given interaction type” (Myers-Scotton (1999: 1216), as cited in Gafaranga (2007: 107)).

In order to illustrate this, let us go back to one of the earlier examples I gave of a political figure addressing the general public in a government building. Even if they are bilingual or multilingual, they would most likely use the linguistic code which links them nationally with their countrymen and countrywomen, more precisely their first language (L1). This implies that L1 is the unmarked code, since it is the one that is to be expected. The politician’s choice can be attributed to their markedness metric and the social context.

Finally, since Borat and Tutar speak two different languages when they communicate, it is important to touch upon the so-called *parallel mode*. We have already established that the two main characters in the movie are bilingual and according to Gafaranga, “if the medium is bilingual, at least two options are available, namely the parallel mode and the mixed mode” (2007: 182). The parallel mode, therefore, refers to “the possibility for conversation to be conducted in two languages (Gafaranga 2007: 194). I will elaborate on the implications of this linguistic phenomenon later on in my analysis.

Analysis and Discussion

For the purposes of clarity, I have transliterated and translated Tutar’s lines, which are in Bulgarian. Similarly, Borat’s lines, which are in Hebrew, have also been translated into English.

Scene 1:

1. **Tutar:** Tati ...? (Daddy ...?)
 2. **Borat (*speaking Hebrew*):** Why are you living like this?
 3. **Tutar:** Mi, shtoto nyamam mazh, koito da me slozhi v zlatna kletka ... kato taya kuchka Lilyat Tsakanov. (Because I don't have a husband who can put me in a golden cage ... like that bitch Lilyat Tsakanov.)
 4. **Borat (*speaking Hebrew*):** How old are you?
 5. **Tutar:** Petnaiset. (Fifteen.)
 6. **Borat (*speaking Hebrew*):** Fifteen?! You are the oldest unmarried woman in all of Kazakhstan!
 7. **Tutar:** Da, ama sya ti kato si tuka, sichko she stane po-hubavo. (Yeah, but now that you are here, things will get better.)
 8. **Borat (*speaking Hebrew*):** I'm not. I'm off to US&A.
 9. **Tutar:** O, vzemi me s tebe. (O, take me with you.)
 10. **Borat (*speaking Hebrew*):** Not possible.
 11. **Tutar:** Ako ne me vzemesh, shte te skasam na dve parcheta! Sha me vzemesh vednaga s tebe! (If you don't take me with you, I will break you in half! You will take me with you!)
 12. **Tutar:** Molya ta, tati. (Please, Daddy.)
 13. **Borat (*speaking Hebrew*):** Here ... have a piece of onion instead.
 14. **A government agent:** Sagdiyev! Johnny's in the crate. You must leave now.
 15. **Borat (*speaking English*):** Err, nice to meet you...
- (Cohen & Woliner, 2020, 05:16)

In this first exchange between Tutar and her father, viewers begin to form their first impression of the adolescent girl based on her physical appearance, but also on the linguistic code she uses. In the scene, Tutar lives in very bad and demeaning conditions; she is dressed poorly; her hair is messy and unwashed, and her face and hands are quite dirty. Even before she has uttered a word, viewers begin to make judgements about her and her background. Generally speaking, our initial impression of Tutar in this scene is of a coarse, primitive and uncultured

girl. To viewers in Bulgaria, Tutar's lack of refinement is reinforced by the linguistic code she uses with her father, more precisely non-standard Bulgarian. The use of non-standard speech is essentially judged less favorably than its counterpart. In this respect, vernacular linguistic varieties conjure up images of language users who do not come from a prestigious social class. Because of this, our attitude towards Tutar is impacted somewhat negatively by her use of non-standard Bulgarian. Milroy (2007: 133) states that our language attitudes are "dominated by powerful ideological positions that are largely based on the supposed existence of the standard form" (as cited in Deutschmann & Steinvall (2020: 654)). In this respect, it is also important to explore the concept of *linguistic stereotyping*. According to Lippi-Green (2012), this is "the tendency for people to categorize and judge others on the merits of their language output" (as cited in Deutschmann & Steinvall (2020: 652)). Naturally, Bulgarian viewers cannot help but be impacted by linguistic stereotyping when they hear Tutar using a vernacular variety of Bulgarian, since standard forms are more favored than their non-standard counterparts (Deutschmann & Steinvall 2020). From this, we could conclude that linguistic varieties are grouped in relation to the social prestige they carry, i.e., they are not treated equally (Blommaert 2005). Indeed, inequality is linked and even organized through the indexical meanings which are generally associated with language forms (Blommaert 2005: 73).

One of the non-standard linguistic units, which immediately stands out to Bulgarian speakers, is presented in line 12: *Molya **ta**, tati (Please, Daddy)*. The bolded phrase is the non-standard form of *te*. *Te*, in turn, is the contracted form of the personal pronoun *teb/e* (*you*), which takes the accusative case in Bulgarian (Vlahova-Ruykova n.d.). The use of the vernacular *ta* instead of the standard *te* indexes Tutar's provincialism and low status. This is further reinforced by other non-standard forms such as *sha* instead of *shte* (*will*) (line 11). Indeed, Tutar's speech points to a social class which is looked down upon and disfavored by the general public. As noted, people's speech reveals a lot of extralinguistic information about them, namely their gender, their social background, their origin, their educational status, etc. (Blommaert 2005: 11). Consequently, the speech Tutar uses indexes coarseness and lack of refinement, which essentially creates the image of an adolescent girl who is not well educated or who comes from a lower social class. This echoes the earlier argument that our attitude to speakers who use non-standard speech is shaped by linguistic stereotyping and language ideologies (Deutschmann & Steinvall 2020).

Pursuing this further, Maria Bakalova, who plays Tutar in the movie, comments on her character's speech:

No matter that I'm speaking Bulgarian, I'm speaking with a lot of Romani words because we have a Romani society in Bulgaria and some of the words, some of the letters are more hard and same with the way she [Tutar] is walking, the way she is thinking, I think. (Bakalova, 2021 14:51)

Maria Bakalova's comment reinforces the link between Tutar's non-standard speech, her physical appearance and mental process. In this respect, both her inner and outer roughness are linguistically underpinned.

The notion of coarseness and roughness is enhanced even further in line 11, where Tutar screams at her father in Bulgarian. If we take into account Austin's *How to Do Things with Words* (1962), utterances can be classified into different speech acts, i.e. acts which serve a particular communicative function, such as asserting, apologizing, complimenting, promising, etc. (Berdini & Bianchi n.d.). Essentially, our utterances have a performative function (ibid.). According to Austin's classification of speech acts, Tutar's remark in line 11 can be analyzed as a commissive act, more precisely a threat. However, in addition to referring to the action, this utterance also indexes a part of Tutar's character, namely her unruly and wild nature. The intensification of the threat is further reinforced through the intonational force of the utterance, which in turn, cements the image of a feral girl. Tutar's ferocity is enhanced considerably at the agricultural supply store, where she screams in fury at Borat in Bulgarian. In addition to this, she also uses profane language at her father, which renders her even more striking.

As previously stated, standard forms are generally viewed more favorably, while their non-standard counterparts are rather looked down upon as indexing a lower social background (Deutschmann & Steinvall 2020). Because of this, the use of vernacular Bulgarian in this first exchange depicts Tutar as a seemingly primitive and uncultured girl. This image is further reinforced by the poor conditions in which she lives. Recall that Tutar is also enthusiastic about the idea of living in a cage as well as being offered to an older man. The demeaning views she has about herself and, by extension, about other young girls underline the notion of primitiveness and roughness even more. Additionally, as we saw, the indexical meaning of Tutar's language

also portrays her as wild and baffling to both the people she comes across in the movie and TV viewers in general.

In this scene below, however, we are shown a different side of Tutar:

Scene 2:

1. **Tutar:** Vizh, Tati! V Amerika tatkovtsite darzhat za raka dashterite si.
2. **Borat (*speaking Hebrew*):** He probably forgot to bring a leash.
3. **Tutar:** Tate, hvani me rakata, zashtoto inache izglezhda, che se prestruvash.
4. (*Borat uses a plastic bag to hold Tutar's hand.*)

Cohen & Woliner (2020 23:56)

In this exchange, Tutar again uses Bulgarian with her father, but unlike the previous scene, in which the former language indexes the young girl's wildness and supposedly low social status, here, Bulgarian seems to portray a side of Tutar that is loving and hopeful of fostering a closer and more special relationship with her father. In line 1, the young girl points out that fathers hold their daughters' hands in America. Tutar's remark could serve as a subtle hint to Borat to do the same thing. When he does not seem to understand, Tutar states her wish directly (line 3), which consequently causes him to hold her hand with a plastic bag. In this scene, therefore, Bulgarian could be argued to represent a more approachable side of Tutar as well as her child-like nature. In fact, Tutar's desire to become closer with her father can also be witnessed in the first scene where she is excited to see Borat and then asks him to take her to America with him. This naturally stands in stark contrast with the young girl's wildness and alleged provincialism which we also encountered in the first scene.

Despite Tutar's eagerness to have a more personal relationship with Borat, our first impressions of her may not be that flattering. However, we soon begin to realize that there is more to her than meets the eye, when she starts to speak English, albeit with an accent. The use of a second language challenges our initial stereotypical judgements about Tutar as the uncultured and primitive girl we considered her to be.

Scene 3:

1. **Borat (*speaking Hebrew*):** You went to the wrong address! It's over there.
2. **Tutar (*speaking English*):** I did not.
3. **Borat:** Come on, it's titty time.

4. **Tutar:** No, I'm not doing it!
 5. **Borat:** Why not?
 6. **Tutar:** Because I'm beautiful as I am. And I don't need to be given as a gift to a man to be worth something.
 7. **Borat:** Yes, you do, it says so in the book.
 8. **Tutar:** The Nadia Akatov story is a lie.
 9. **Borat:** It not a lie. It's true.
 10. **Tutar:** It is a lie. I did it.
- (Cohen & Woliner, 2020, 56:37)

While this is not the first scene in which Tutar uses English, it is the first scene in which she confronts her father with it. In most other cases Tutar speaks to Borat in Bulgarian, but here, she decides to code-switch and voice her thoughts and indignation in English. This could be an example of what Blom and Gumperz (1986: 425) call *metaphorical code-switching* (as cited in Bleichenbacher (2008: 13)). Language users generally resort to this when they want to “add a special social meaning” (ibid.,13). *Metaphorical code-switching* is necessarily linked with the symbolism that is attributed to the linguistic code speakers select (ibid.,13). Prior to this exchange, Tutar was exposed to progressive values, which were eye-opening to her as a human being and as a woman, in particular. Jeanise Jones, who was Tutar's babysitter in the movie, told the young girl that she was beautiful the way she was. Likewise, at the Hillsborough Republican Women's Club Meeting, Tutar realizes that men and, by extension, patriarchal societies are not all-knowing, and that their depiction of women is fundamentally wrong and demeaning. The progressive values which Tutar becomes aware of generally represent Westernization, self-sufficiency, self-respect and professional opportunity. It would seem that Tutar links these values with the English language and with the USA, since the country has long been seen as a place where everyone, regardless of their origin and social background, can start anew. Tutar essentially code-switches to English in this scene in order to adopt a more authoritative stance, while also reiterating the same values which she has learned and which she now symbolically links with the linguistic code she uses. Likewise, Tutar's use of English indexes her perceptions of herself as an independent and capable young woman, who can strive for more than marriage and domesticity. The tendency to use linguistic codes to index one's notion of identity is known

as the *Negotiation Principle* (Myers-Scotton 1993b, Scotton 1983, 1988, in Myers-Scotton, (1993: 478)). It actually constitutes the so-called *Markedness Model*, according to which “speakers use the possibility of making code choices to negotiate interpersonal relationships, and by extension to signal their perceptions or desires about group memberships” (Myers-Scotton 1993: 478).

Pursuing this further, in keeping with Myers-Scotton and her Markedness Model, “all linguistic code choices are indexical of a set of rights and obligations holding between participants in the conversational exchange” (1988: 152, as cited in Gafaranga (2007: 105)). Myers-Scotton makes a distinction between an unmarked and a marked code choice. While the former refers to the expected and “routinized” linguistic code (Gafaranga 2007: 108), the latter is used when a speaker wishes to negotiate a new set of rights and obligations, which differs from the one the unmarked code represents (Myers-Scotton 1993: 480). Since most of the preceding scenes feature Tutar speaking Bulgarian to her father, we could suppose that said linguistic code is the unmarked choice, which indexes a particular set of rights and obligations. In this set, Tutar is generally seen as a young, inexperienced girl who loves and admires her father despite his sexism and misogyny. Conversely, Tutar’s code-switching into English in this scene could be interpreted as a marked choice, which not only signals her newest perceptions of self, but also her desire to introduce a new rights and obligations set, in which she portrays herself as an intelligent and self-standing woman, who asserts her freedom from patriarchal control and condescension. In this sense, English becomes the language of confrontation, and it is also used as a distancing device through which Tutar signals her disappointment with her father and her disillusionment from the beliefs she was raised with.

All in all, Tutar’s code-switching into English has several functions. Since it is symbolically linked with progressive values such as self-respect and self-sufficiency, English signals Tutar’s perception of her newly realized self. From this, we could deduce that English is the language which Tutar associates with her identity as an aspiring and capable young woman. Similarly, while it is symbolically connected to progressive values, English also becomes the language of confrontation and emotional distance, as evidenced by Tutar’s indignation with Borat.

Scene 4:

1. **Borat** (*speaking Hebrew*): That was close.
 2. **Tutar**: Dobre de, shto go naprai? (*Okay, so why'd you do that?*) Mislya, che go naprai, shtoto me obichash ... i to po sashtiyat nachin, po koito mozhesh da obichash sinovete si. (*I think you did it because you love me ... the same way you love your sons*).
 3. **Borat** (*speaking Hebrew*): No. More. So much more.
 4. **Tutar**: Dobre, sya kvo she napraim? (*Okay, so now what are we gonna do?*)
 5. **Borat** (*speaking Hebrew*): You stay here. I will go home.
 6. **Tutar**: Az she doida s teb. Az iskam da doida. (*I'll come with you. I want to come.*)
 7. **Borat** (*speaking Hebrew*): No, no. You want to live in a cage? I forbid it.
 8. **Tutar**: Ti ne mozhesh da se varnesh. (*You can't go back.*)
 9. **Borat**: Okay.
- (Cohen & Woliner, 2020, 1:23:00)

In this exchange, Tutar again code-switches into Bulgarian. Prior to their conversation, however, the young girl used English as her main linguistic code due to her work as a journalist in the USA. Here, the switch to Bulgarian could be attributed to what Blom and Gumperz (1986: 424 ff) refer to as *situational code-switching*, since there is a change from a professional to a more relaxed and informal setting (as cited Bleichenbacher (2008: 13)). The addressee in this case is different as well, which could also impact the choice of a linguistic code. Naturally, while we could attribute Tutar's use of Bulgarian to these external factors, I argue that the change might have a deeper meaning and reason. Tutar's code-switching into Bulgarian in this scene could again be metaphorical rather than situational because of the symbolism that said language carries. Recall that in most conversations with Borat, Tutar uses Bulgarian, which arguably indexes a particular set of rights and obligations, where Borat's daughter loves and looks up to him. While she sometimes lashes out in anger and profane language, generally, the use of Bulgarian indexes primarily warmth and child-like admiration. Here, I argue that the situation is largely the same, as Tutar transitions from the aspiring journalist that she has become to the young girl who loves and cares for her father's safety and well-being. The linguistic transition from English into Bulgarian underpins the psychological transition that Tutar undergoes. From this, we could conclude that Bulgarian indexes filial love and compassion. Early on in my analysis, I stated that Tutar's use of non-standard Bulgarian points to her lower social status as

well as her wild and feral nature. As stated, though, Bulgarian also represents the warm feelings the young girl has for her father, and this last scene cements the importance of a father-daughter relationship.

To sum up, the exchange above exhibits the symbolical associations which are attributed to the use of Bulgarian, more precisely filial love and daughterly concern.

The Parallel Mode: Implications

Throughout the movie, Borat and Tutar's communication takes place via two different languages. This is what Gafaranga and Torras (2001) refer to as the *parallel mode* (Gafaranga 2007: 171), which I discussed earlier. As stated, after the 1990s, people witnessed a considerable increase in mobility, which, in turn, impacted the spread of multilingualism and the way people viewed languages as homogeneous and bounded systems (Blommaert & Rampton 2011: 3-4). Because of political and social changes, linguists turned their attention to mobility and diversity, since these affected the use of languages and language varieties (ibid., 3). Indeed, such social shifts have exposed people to a wide range of languages and linguistic styles (ibid.). As a result, linguistic phenomena such as code-switching, code-mixing and languaging as a whole are now the rule rather than the exception. All this shows that linguistic norms can be changed, challenged and played with, which reinforces the notion that with diversity comes linguistic profusion (Blommaert & Rampton 2011: 7).

Because of this, I believe that the use of the parallel mode and multilingualism in the movie mirrors, albeit hyperbolically, linguistic creativity in the real world. Pursuing this further, we could take the concept and practice of the parallel mode and see how it relates to the complexity of Borat and Tutar's relationship. Recall that Borat was heavily impacted by his sexist and misogynistic views, which made him treat his daughter like a commodity rather than a human being. Similarly, Tutar initially had nothing but love and respect for her father. However, the warm feelings she had were temporarily outshone by her disappointment and anger with Borat until both characters ultimately reconciled and rediscovered their love for each other. The use of the parallel mode could therefore mirror the complexity of Borat and Tutar's father-daughter relationship as well.

Conclusion

This paper aimed to analyze the indexicality of the linguistic codes and the reason behind Tutar's code-switching. As noted, languages do not simply convey referential, but also indexical meaning, which ultimately leads speakers to make various character judgements.

In this respect, the indexical and symbolical complexity of both Bulgarian and English in the scenes above mirrors Tutar's intriguing and multilayered character. The use of a vernacular variety of Bulgarian could be argued to index two different sides of Tutar's identity. On the one hand, Bulgarian, more precisely, non-standard Bulgarian may represent Tutar's seemingly low social status and ferocity. On the other hand, Bulgarian also points to a set of rights and obligations in which Tutar is a young girl whose love and care for Borat portray her as a warm-hearted and emotionally intelligent individual. In this respect, Bulgarian could be seen as the language of compassion and love, as evidenced clearly in the last scene.

Pursuing this further, English is symbolically linked with Westernization and self-sufficiency, but it is also used as a distancing device to index Tutar's anger and disappointment with her father. Indeed, Tutar confronts Borat in English to impose a new set of rights and obligations in which she presents herself as a strong and self-reliant young woman.

Additionally, the use of the parallel mode could have a number of implications. This paper discusses it as a mirroring technique, which reflects the impact of multilingualism and linguistic profusion in today's global world. Seen from a more psychological perspective, the parallel mode could also reinforce the complexity of Borat and Tutar's father-daughter relationship.

Note that this paper has analyzed a few scenes from the movie *Borat Subsequent Moviefilm*, but the use of code-switching, linguistic indexicality and the parallel mode could be traced in other scenes as well. Therefore, any future research would add to the richness and complexity of said linguistic phenomena as well as to the charm of *Borat Subsequent Moviefilm*.

Bibliography

Bakalova, M. (2021, February 5). *SBIFF Cinema Society Q&A - Borat Subsequent Moviefilm* [Video]. Interview by R. Durling. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vTklCOi_ZHU&t=909s

- Berdini & Bianchi n.d.*: Berdini, F., & Bianchi, C. John Langshaw Austin (1911-1960). [date of entering 21.01.2023]. < <https://iep.utm.edu/austin/> >.]
- Bleichenbacher 2008*: Bleichenbacher, L. Multilingualism in the Movies: Hollywood Characters and Their Language Choices. Tübingen: A. Francke Verlag, 2008.
- Blommaert 2005*: Blommaert, J. Discourse: A Critical Introduction. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Blommaert & Rampton 2011*: Blommaert, J., & Rampton, B. Language and Superdiversity. - Diversities, 2/2011, 1-21.
- Brown & Levinson 1987*: Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. Politeness: Some universals in language usage. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Cohen, S. B., Levinson, M., & Hines, A. (Producers), & Woliner, J. (Director). (2020). *Borat Subsequent Moviefilm* [Motion picture]. NY: Four by Two Films.
- Deutschmann & Steinvall 2020*: Deutschmann, M., & Steinvall, A. Combatting Linguistic Stereotyping and Prejudice by Evoking Stereotypes. - Open Linguistics, 1/2020, 651-671.
- Gafaranga 2007*: Gafaranga, J. Talk in Two Languages. Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.
- Myers-Scotton, C. 1993*: Myers-Scotton, C. (1993). Common and Uncommon Ground: Social and Structural Factors in Codeswitching. - Language in Society, 4/1993, 475-503.
- Myers-Scotton & Bolonyai 2001*: Myers-Scotton, C., & Bolonyai, A. Calculating speakers: Codeswitching in a rational choice model. - Language in Society, 1/2001, 1-28.
- Vlahova-Ruykova n.d.*: Vlahova-Ruykova, R. ПРАКТИЧЕСКА ГРАМАТИКА. БАЛГАРСКИ ЕЗИК. Лични местоимения. [ПРАКТИЧЕСКА ГРАМАТИКА. БЪЛГАРСКИ ЕЗИК. Лични местоимения]. [date of entering 21.01.2023]. < <https://www.slav.uni-sofia.bg/grammar/morf16.html> >.]
- Thara & Poornachandran 2018*: Thara, S., & Poornachandran, P. Code-Mixing: A Brief Survey. 2018 International Conference on Advances in Computing, Communications and Informatics (ICACCI), 2018, 2382-2388.