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Immigrant Turkish

Through migration from Turkey and some Balkan countries, considerable Turkish-speaking diaspora groups have emerged in North Western Europe. These migrant speakers of Turkish have various backgrounds and do not constitute any uniform ‘ethnic minorities’. Linguistically, they are, as a rule, living in unbalanced, asymmetrical contact situations, their first language fulfilling only community functions. Whereas several aspects of their acquisition and use of the dominant languages in the host societies have been studied, little attention has been given to Turkish as the dominated language. Only some preparatory work has been carried out in this field, e.g., in some excellent contributions by A. Backus, H. Boeschoten, C.W. Pfaff, L. Verhoeven, and others.

The following remarks are based on observations made in the course of the short history of Turkish in Scandinavia and Germany. It is obvious that the present situation is a transitional one with processes of language loss and shift in the second and third generation. However, the chances for the survival of Turkish, the institutional responses to its presence, or the language maintenance efforts of the Turkish speech communities themselves will not be discussed here. The focus will be on the development of Turkish itself and the changes it is undergoing.

Variational patterns

Very little attention has been paid so far to the question of whether new local varieties of Turkish are developing. To answer such a question, thorough investigations at the phonological, lexical, morphosyntactic, and textual level would be necessary. What observable linguistic features - as to what is used and what is not used - distinguish Turkish diaspora speech? In this respect, several distinctions are necessary: we find rather diverse variational patterns in individuals, domains, sub-
groups, generations. The development will depend on the specific ling­
guistic environments.

In particular, studies of differences between the generations are
important, especially with regard to the input. Most phenomena found
in the speech of the first generation will certainly not be typical of
future Turkish diaspora varieties. In the non-first generations, compe­
tence in the socially dominated language A and the dominant language
B differs considerably from that of the first generation. We find signs
of delay and stagnation in the acquisition of Turkish (Verhoeven &
Boeschoten, 1986), of failure to acquire and use certain linguistic
devices, of heavy restrictions in the use of Turkish, of breaks in the
linguistic tradition, and thus of imminent language loss, namely indivi­
dual attrition and erosion from generation to generation.

B influence

An interesting but highly controversial factor is the linguistic influence
from the dominant co-areal majority language. In current research, there
is a certain tendency to disparage such influence, obviously as a reac­
tion to all too naive and premature contrastive analyses of the linguistic
results of contact situations. In our view, the study of this influence
should be vitalized in less naive attempts which take into account,
synchronously, the complex variational patterns of the ‘donor’ and
‘recipient’ languages and, diachronically, their previous developmental
stages. It is also important to note that linguistic influence cannot be
studied in isolation from the sociolinguistic setting. Here, we will focus
on the influence of German as the ‘donor language’ B on Turkish as the
‘recipient language’ A.

Particularly, we will take up certain theoretical aspects and dwell
upon some issues concerning how the study of this influence could
contribute to our general insights into contact processes. Many analyses
in this field have been based on the classical models of Weinreich
(1953) and Haugen (e.g., 1972, 1973). Our own model of analysis
deviates from these in some important points. It is meant as a frame­
work for describing linguistic contact phenomena in a coherent way,
also as a basis for typological comparison; and we intend to use a
simple terminology which is easily applicable to various cases of lan­
guage contact. The model is being elaborated in a comprehensive study
which will also include linguistic analyses of other Turkic contact situa­
tions, past and present. Here, the purpose is only to give a very short
overview of some of the issues involved. Several important aspects will be left out altogether. The considerations include criticism of some basic concepts of traditional contact linguistics, for instance, 'borrowing', 'transfer', 'switching', 'interference', 'integration', and 'substitution'. The misleading metaphorics suggested by such terms often strongly influences the way linguists conceive of the processes characterizing interactions between languages in contact.

Code-copying

Since we focus on the possible development of new varieties of Turkish, that is, on what is happening with one of the two codes involved, we restrict our attention to cases where the basic structural pattern of the clause is Turkish. At the dispense of other possible phenomena of code interaction ('language-mixing'), the focus will be on the linguistic analysis of intraclausal code-copying. We refer to cases where the minority language is the basic code and the majority language the code that is (in the usual terminology) 'switched to' or 'borrowed from'. Thus we disregard cases of 'code-switching' implying alternate choices of codes, in the sense of changing code over clauses, e.g., when German clauses, sentences or longer passages of speech are inserted into a discourse primarily conducted in Turkish. 'Code-switching' is also inadequate as a general cover term, since it generally refers to the juxtaposition of elements belonging to different grammatical systems or subsystems. Thus even the notion of 'intrasentential code-switching' implies an alternation between two codes. We prefer 'code interaction' as a neutral cover term for (intra- or extracausal) 'code-alternation' and (intraclausal) 'code-copying'.

The clausal level is chosen on empirical grounds, since it proves relatively easy to define the syntactical frame there, that is, to decide whether the basic ('matrix') code is A or B. It might well be that some products of certain other contact situations (e.g., Spanish-English contact situations in the USA) are more difficult to identify in this respect. Admittedly, for Turkish spoken in North Western Europe, too, there may be marginal cases in which it is impossible to assign a particular language to a given clause. Anyhow, purely quantitative criteria are not decisive for the language assignment. A clause may obviously be A-coded in spite of a heavy amount of B elements.

Normally, it seems appropriate to apply 'language indexing' to the clausal level and not to assign a deviant index to etymologically foreign
elements (of B origin) used in an A clause. Apart from quotations and some similar cases, the use of a B-element in A practically always represents more than just a switch in language. Our point is that B-elements are not just inserted and juxtaposed to A-elements. The clause has a strict structural economy, and there is always some adjustment involved, in some way and to some degree. Thus we will not say that German elements are 'switched' into Turkish speech, even if they are used only very occasionally.

Kinds of code interaction

Under the general heading of code interaction, we distinguish 'code-alternation' (CA) from 'code-copying' (CC), and 'extraclausal' code-alternation (ECA) from 'intraclausal' code-alternation (ICA). Finally, we distinguish 'momentary' code-copies (MCC) from more or less 'conventionalized' ones (CCC).

As for the situation within the clause, we thus prefer a tripartite classification: ICA, MCC, CCC. ICA produces 'plain code-switches', that is, B items that are not incorporated at all. Their status may be indicated by cues such as hesitation, asides, and translation or paraphrase (cf. Pfaff, 1979: 297). In the case of CC, a B item is copied into A, globally or not (v. infra). Calque phenomena are also taken to be cases of code-copying, not a different type of interaction. MCC refers to sporadic, ephemeral instances of copying (elements used 'only once'); it corresponds to Weinreich's 'nonce-borrowing' (1953: 11), which relies on the basic difference between langue and parole. Correspondingly, CCC refers to copies that are habitually used and have more lasting effects in the linguistic community. A further distinction might be based on the criterion whether a CCC necessarily presupposes bilingual ability (some degree of competence in both languages) or may occur in utterances of monolinguals. Note that examples of established 'loans' (e.g., from the history of Turkic languages) are also useful in general discussions of CC, since MCC must once also have been the point of departure for their conventionalization processes.

Terminology

Terms such as 'switching' and 'borrowing' have often been used to distinguish not only between different degrees of conventionalization but also, for instance, between 'morphologically' non-integrated and
integrated elements. Some researchers have even taken the distinction to be a matter of volume, discussing how large a chunk of B must be to represent a 'switch'. We doubt that it is possible to distinguish linguistically 'switched' elements from 'non-switched' ones in a consistent way with such criteria, especially when they are mixed. Our own terminology reflects a classification which enables us to treat closely related phenomena, i.e., all types of copying, in a uniform theoretical framework, instead of postulating rather arbitrary absolute differences which cannot be consistently applied.

The use of elements (units or qualities) emanating from one code within the context of another is often referred to as 'interference'. We also avoid this term because of its negative connotations implying deviations from monolingual norms, suggesting a phenomenon which causes impaired communication. The process of conventionalizing a 'foreign' element is a continuum with gliding transitions between degrees of acceptability. By using the term 'code-copying', we want to be able to refer to the insertion of a 'foreign' element without having to specify this degree and to determine at what point it ceases to be an 'interference'. So-called 'negative' and 'positive' effects of bilingualism are not our concern here; nor are the effects of the knowledge of L1 on the acquisition of L2. In recent literature on language acquisition, 'interference' often refers to negative effects of this kind, generally as opposed to [positive] 'transfer'. By avoiding such terms, we also want to avoid confusion with the concept linked to them.

The above-mentioned term 'borrowing', which stands for one of the basic concepts of traditional contact linguistics, is based on a highly misleading metaphor. Nothing is borrowed in language contact: the 'donor language' is not deprived of anything; and - more importantly - the 'recipient language' does not take over anything which is identical with an element in the 'donor language'. This is rather obvious and may seem trivial, but the use of the metaphor often has undesirable consequences. The same danger is connected with the term 'transfer'. It is too often ignored that there is no identity involved: the elements of the 'donor language' merely serve as models for imitation.

**Copying**

As already indicated, the concept of *copying* would account more adequately for the relevant phenomena described as 'borrowings' or 'transfers' in the literature. The basic concept behind the term is that linguis-
tic elements - both units and patterns - are copied from B to A. (Both segmental units as 'blocks' of qualities and individual qualities themselves are referred to as 'elements'; v. infra.) Therewith, the linguistic copies belong to other systems than their originals, which has important consequences. The copying can be global and selective. Global copying means that B units-'blocks' are copied into A as a whole. Selective copying implies that just one or more selected structural properties of B elements are copied onto A elements. Here we can only hint at some of the issues involved in copying processes and at some principles of classification.

Alpha lects

Code-copying does not mean any fusion of A and B, e.g., of Turkish and German. It is, however, typical of certain functional varieties of Turkish which - as part of the linguistic repertoire in the immigrant situation - are used for in-group communication and which we shall refer to as 'Alpha lects'. The same speaker of A will behave differently depending on the type of interlocutor involved. In communication with another bilingual who shares the same linguistic background he may use Alpha. If the interlocutor is not bilingual, Alpha is not likely to be chosen, since it would imply a breakdown in communication. The social consequences of the lect choice are predictable. Note that this definition does not specify the amount of code-copying. Since hardly any first-generation Turk is purely monolingual, the varieties of Turkish used in the diaspora communities at large are in principle not 'normal Turkish' any more, but already Alpha lects, even if they happen to be rather modest in code-copying.

There are, however, also Alpha varieties which display extensive code-copying. In particular, young and more competent bilinguals of the second generation may use a relatively low-copying Alpha variety when speaking to their elders (or other first-generation Turks with a more limited B competence) and another relatively high-copying variety with each other. A high-copying variety reserved for in-group conversation between Holland-Turkish bilingual peers has been described by Backus (1989). Here we will not discuss the social reasons for the frequent code-copying sometimes encountered among adolescents growing up in an immigrant environment, for instance, possible 'neutrality strategies' to avoid choices expressing preference for A or B (as, e.g., in code-alternation).
Sources and differences

The sources for copying are specific varieties of German which are usually also reflected in the bilingual speaker's own German. For the first generation, these are often, initially, makeshift communicative varieties which we refer to as 'Beta lects'. Later on, the speaker may copy elements from more native German varieties which are also likely to be reflected in more advanced stages of his German interlanguage. For the non-first generations there is a more complex input. The B elements serving as models may belong to the speaker's own German, which is, in general, relatively strong. They may, however, also belong to the Turkish Alpha lect of the first generation. (Examples of various types of copies in the language of the second generation of Turks living in Germany are to be found in Menz 1991.)

There are various kinds and degrees of difference between original and copy with respect to certain properties. The differences may be considerable, and there are often structural reasons for them. Before making any statements on contrastive grounds, it is, however, necessary to identify the source of the copies. The result of copying cannot be analysed in terms of adaptation if it is not clear which variety of B the original belongs to. Anyhow, the properties of the copies do not always reflect the B proficiency of the speaker directly, that is, not all differences are (as is sometimes claimed) due to 'imperfect learning' of B. As just stated, B elements found in the speech of members of the second generation (with a native or native-like mastery of B) may also emanate from an Alpha 'home language' spoken by their parents.

Global and selective copying in an unbalanced dominance situation is likely to lead to unidirectional convergence, making A more similar to B. Surface structures common to A and B provide equivalence positions and thus favour copying. (This might also mean that typological closeness of A and B lead to relatively rapid convergence.) On the other hand, all kinds of adaptation to be discussed further on, material reshaping, combinational restructuring etc., create more similarity with A and thus reduce structural conflicts.

Global copying

Global copying means insertion of copies of stretches of B speech, morphological-lexical-phraseological units of various kinds which we will refer to as 'blocks'. These are items which possess a material
shape, and may be morphemically simple or complex, bound or free, comprise one or more words, and belong to different morpheme categories, word classes and phrase types (including 'petrified' or 'idiomatic' expressions). They do not simply represent 'the phonemic shape of a word and its meaning' (in the sense of Haugen, 1953: 2, 90), but constitute blocks of different properties: in particular material, combinational, and semantic ones.

Insertion

The basic A-code provides the clausal frame, normally including combinational patterns and function elements. The global copy is inserted into one of the specific slots which its A 'equivalent' would fill; we refer to individual positions of this kind as 'insertion points'. Note that we speak of the clausal frame and the insertion of copies in a diachronically linguistic sense, and do not claim that, in any psycholinguistic sense, clauses are 'produced' or 'processed' in these two steps. The insertion is basically a question of the speaker's subjective assessment of surface-structure equivalence. Lack of real typological equivalence does not, however, prevent insertion.

The global copy normally assumes grammatical A-morphology signalling clause hierarchy, e.g., banofa gittim 'I went to the station'. Also, copies larger than single words are 'integrated' into grammatical B structures in this way. This kind of 'adaptation to A morphology' not only means that bound morphemes are attached (banof-a 'to the station'); it is an insertion in the same sense if the function marker is an unbound one: (banof önünde 'in front of the station'). Consequently, it is just a natural result of the insertion if - in the awkward perspective of 'switching' theories - there seem to be 'asymmetrical patterns' which maintain the integrity of the A syntax, but one-sidedly 'suspend' B grammar. E.g., in the example just quoted, a Turkish suffix morpheme -(y)A and a Turkish morpheme order are used; German rules would require a preposition (zum, with inherent definite article). According to our framework, in cases such as berišt-i Ƞraybîn yap- 'to write the report', units which are intimately connected in B (here: object Bericht + verb schreiben) are not copied as a whole (e.g., den Bericht schreiben as an actional phrase), but as separate blocks, each one assuming function markers provided by the clausal A frame. Thus, if B function markers (articles, plurals etc.) do not occur, it
is not because a whole B complex has been copied and undergone grammatical suspension.

The very fact that German blocks are freely inserted into slots followed by bound Turkish clause-syntactic markers, falsifies the allegedly universal ‘free morpheme constraint’ (v. infra). Moreover, this morphological ‘integration’ into A cannot be referred to as a ‘switch’ from B to A, since the A clause is the very frame for the insertion. (Problems concerning what is actually already present in the clause when a copy is inserted cannot be discussed at length in the present chapter.) Nor can it be called a ‘substitution’, since there have never been any B function markers to replace. Thus this ‘integration’ is no criterion for distinguishing degrees of conventionalization.

A morphemically complex A constituent (word, word-group, phrase) which is either entirely native or consists entirely of one or more B-copies is referred to as a solid complex. A mixed complex has some native and some copied part(s).

Stages of development

In the first generation of Turkish-speakers in Germany, there is, at an early stage, relatively large tolerance of globally copied German blocks, almost exclusively free forms, predominantly ‘content units’, mostly single nouns. Bound blocks and/or grammatical (derivational or relational) blocks are mostly copied as parts of complex ones, e.g., kind-lr ‘children’, b*rot-c’n ‘roll’. Although the clausal frame provided by the basic A-code normally includes the necessary clause-hierarchic function markers, these may also be replaced by an equivalent marker within a complex copy from B. Thus a complex such as sum banof ‘to the station’ may function like banofa. Globally copied German prepositional phrases show a high degree of structural equivalence with Turkish postpositional phrases with respect to external combinational properties. However, the originals of such complexes are often idiomatic, stereotyped phrases.

At later stages, bound and/or grammatical blocks are copied isolatedly and used productively. This is valid for derivative ‘content’ units as well as for relational units (free or inflectional ‘function elements’). Although the clausal A frame normally provides the clause-hierarchic function markers, these may also be replaced by productive global copies of equivalent B markers. The history of Turkic shows many cases where B function markers are - contrary to some other constraints
and principles proposed in the literature - used productively; cf. the copying of many Persian, Arabic and Slavic function words (such as conjunctions). Needless to say, it is often difficult to draw the borderline between content and relational units, e.g., in the case of B auxiliaries.

The originals

Between the original and the copy there are similarities and differences, which should be described. At first, therefore, we should try to define which originals serve as the object of copying. Absence of elements such as gender/number inflection or articles does not represent syntactic 'simplification', if these elements have never been copied. No inflection or article has been 'lost' or 'deleted' if there is no reason to assume that it was present in the original copied. It is sometimes said that B grammar is 'suspended' within B stretches when they lack 'syntactic cohesion' (Muysken, 1987). Some copies which seem to lack syntactic cohesion have never had any 'fuller structures' to be syntactically 'simplified' or any function elements to be 'reduced'. Some 'telegraphic switches' (Boeschoten, 1991) certainly go back to global blocks which do not contain any 'fuller structures'. Others may be the results of material and/or combinational restructuring (v. infra).

Substitution and reproduction

Relatively close similarity to the original may be called 'reproduction'. Haugen's term 'importation' for successful copying again suggests that the corresponding units in B and A are identical. Replacement of B properties by others is known as 'substitution'. The differences are often due to adaptation, modification in the direction of A because of the grammatical and lexical incongruence between the two codes. The restructuring may, however, be basically A-independent and impossible to explain by simple contrastive analyses.

Many copies which seem to lack 'syntactic cohesion' or 'integrity'-types reflecting 'a certain telegraphic slowness' (Boeschoten, 1991) - may have been subjected to material and/or combinational restructuring. The analysis of such cases seems to suggest that typological distance does not favour 'suspension of grammar' in particular, but restructuring of code-copies in general.
As for the first generation of Turkish-speakers in North West Europe, there is much substitution at an early stage: little tolerance to foreign structures, imposition of A-properties upon the copied blocks. More advanced acquisition of B at later stages renders more similar copies possible. It is, however, obvious that differences between originals and copies do not always decrease steadily, as is often presumed. The modifications do not seem to reflect the speaker’s level of B proficiency in a straightforward way.

Material reshaping

With regard to material reshaping - restructuring of the shape of the block - there is a gliding scale, a continuum from reproduction to very extensive substitution.

There is, inter alia, phonetic adaptation in that phonetic A-properties are substituted for B-properties. Thus, [x] in Dach ‘roof’ may be rendered as [k], [ç] in Küche ‘kitchen’ as [h], etc. Differences in shape between originals and copies are often due to systemic differences of the elements in question. What is substituted for what, largely depends on how B segments are perceived and phonologically classified in A. For instance, since Turkish [k] in front syllables is generally predorsal-palatal, German [k] sounds even in front environments tend to be classified as minus front, e.g., [kˈrimi] ‘(crime) thriller’ (copied from Krimi). Phonotactical B properties are replaced by A properties, e.g., in [kˈraŋk] ‘(reported) sick’ (from krank), [ʃˈpedist] ‘night-duty’ (from Spätdienst). Accent properties (stress, high tone) may be replaced by A-properties, e.g., [bá:ˈnhoːf], [ˈʊnfal] by [ˈbánoːf], [ˈʊnfaːf].

There is also more comprehensive reshaping of blocks: Weihnachten ‘Christmas’ is copied as vaynak, Überweisung ‘transfer’ as übvayz etc. It may go so far that a typical, salient single element of the block is selected to represent the whole of it, e.g., ameld'n yap- or even an yap- from sich anmelden ‘to register’; cf. Holland-Turkish spoel from gespoeld ‘rinsed’ (Backus, 1989).

Copies of B adjectives are often inserted attributively in uniform, generalized shapes. There is absence of gender and number inflection on borrowed adjectives in reshaped complex blocks such as bözc man ‘the evil man’. An adjective may also be copied as such, not as part of a nominal phrase; e.g., in doyuğ adamlar ‘German men’, the copy of the variable adjective (deutsch) also exhibits a generalized shape. Generalized adjective forms may even be conventionalized. Thus, in some
Soviet Turkic languages, adjectives copied from Russian are used with generalized agreement markers (e.g., *social'ni'y naukalar* 'social sciences').

Much of what has traditionally been classified as 'grammatical adaptation' belongs, in our view, to material reshaping. In a Holland-Turkish example such as *op oog gözlük var* 'on the eyes there are glasses' (Backus, 1989: 37) there is obviously no Dutch block *op oog*, in which Dutch grammar could have been 'suspended', just a reshaped material copy of a fuller Dutch prepositional phrase. The same is valid for word-internal structures, e.g., *angstelt* 'employee' (from *Angesteller*).

As for the first generation of Turkish immigrants, there is at an early stage often strong and unpredictable reshaping, and, at later stages, more systematic substitution. Members of non-first generations may totally dispense with imposing Turkish phonic properties upon German blocks. However, they do not always. Apparently, there is not simply more reproduction, the more advanced stages of acquisition are reached. The material shape of global copies is not permanently growing more similar to that of the originals. The whole problem is partly a question of the sources the copies are taken from; but it also concerns the diachrony (with respect to conventionalized B elements) of the specific Alpha lect serving as the 'matrix' code for insertion. We shall return to this question further on.

**Grammatical modification**

As for grammatical modification, the copies are realigned on the morphosyntactical A structure, classified - on the basis of some equivalence - into morphosyntactical categories to be able to function in the A clause, that is, prepared to be inserted into specific slots and to assume grammatical A-morphology signalling clause hierarchy. As already indicated, however, this very insertion does not mean any substitution, since the A clause is a natural frame already present to accept the global copies instead of A-blocks. If no element with clause-syntactical functions has been copied, none can be replaced.

To be inserted as predicate cores, copies of German verbs are normally *morphologically accommodated* by a word formation device well-known from other Turkic contact situations, the set conversion formula infinitive + *yap-*, where the last element carries the predicator (predicative inflections). Thus, in *bir mektup şrayb'ın yap'ı* 'she wrote a letter',...
the copy consists of şraybın', whereas the whole stretch şraybın yap- 'to write' has been inserted into the clause. In some cases, the accommodation does not take place; cf. the Norwegian-Turkish example kjep-tüm 'I bought', where the copy of a Norwegian verbal stem is inserted directly (Brendemoen, 1987). The case 'spiyonla- 'to spy', however, is essentially different, representing a Turkish denominal word formation from 'spiyon 'spy' (cf. Spion). The accommodated element may be a more comprehensive actional phrase, e.g., fliżn leg'n yap- 'to lay tiles' (from Fliesen legen); cf. spoken Soviet Uzbek cases like očirit zaynyat qil- 'to hold the place' (Russian zanjat 'očered').

One aspect of grammatical modification concerns change of combinability properties, often according to A patterns. B-properties of combinability may be replaced by A-properties. A copy of the German word Gold "gold" may assume the syntactic combinability of Turkish altın, so that uses like golt saat 'gold watch' are possible. Changes in the combinability of copies of Unfall 'accident', Umbau 'rebuilding' lead to such uses as unfal ol- 'to have an accident' and umbau ol- 'to be rebuilt, altered'. B auxiliaries such as muß may also shift word-class. In complex blocks with grammatical-relational constituents, e.g., in the plural kindir 'children', the directive expression sum banoğ 'to the station', or the syntagma as bekir 'as a baker', combinability properties may also be replaced: kindîrler 'the children' (used with a Turkish plural), sum banoğ (gitti) (used with a Turkish case form indicating direction), as bekir olarak (with olarak as a Turkish equivalent to als).

This means that the etymologically German function marker of the complex block may remain as a functionally redundant (possibly reinforcing) element. This does not imply any real duplication from a synchronical point of view, since the former B marker is not 'productive'. This case is encountered in other Turkic contact situations, where globally copied prepositional phrases involving etymologically non-Turkic prepositions are inserted in positions which entail Turkic case-marking. In Iranian Azeri, copies of Persian prepositional phrases such as hâreg az şahr 'outside the town' are marked with Turkic case endings, which allow for adverbial use of the phrases, e.g., hâriğ az şahr-dâ (Kiral, 1991: 20). Analogous structures in Tajik result from a reverse process: complex results of copying of this kind in Uzbek dialects serve as models for further copying in the opposite direction. Thus Turkic case suffixes are used 'productively' as function markers in the Tajik clause frame, taking over (or reinforcing) the signalling of adverbial function.
From the synthetic point of view chosen so far, the blocks are taken to be parts of higher functional units. However, complex blocks can also be described analytically, as functional units which are decomposed into constituents. As such, they can also be said to have internal combinational properties, which may be replaced by A properties. This kind of restructuring cannot be discussed in detail in the present chapter. Complex global copies are often the object of both material and combinational restructuring, as in the Holland-Turkish example collected by Backus (1989: 36): *reet interesseren yap*—'not to interest [somebody] a damn' (without object and *geen* 'no').

**Semantic modification**

As for the semantic modification, B-properties may be replaced, especially by A-properties, e.g., *havuz* (copied from *Haus*) is used for 'home' by identification with *ev* 'house, home', the significate of which is substituted for the German one. German influence may explain the underdifferentiating use of *doğru* 'right' for 'really' (*gerçekten*) (cf. *wirklich*, which means both), or the confusion of synonyms such as *başka, diğer, öbür, öteki* (Csató, 1988); cf. *anderer*. We find many examples of seeming semantic modification in Turkish spoken by the first generation. Copies such as *krank* (cf. *krank* 'sick') 'unfit for work', *hayım* (cf. *Heim* 'home') 'hostel' obviously differ in meaning from their Standard German equivalents. As long as it is not clear from which variety of German they are taken, they cannot, however, be analysed with any certainty in terms of adaptation.

**Syntactic constraints**

There are certainly syntactic constraints on global copying, that is, as to the syntactic contexts in which it is possible. Although it would be interesting to try to determine the possible orders of constituents in A sentences (clauses, morphemes, words, word-groups, phrases) with regard to their B etymology, we will not discuss this issue here. Many investigators have tried to determine, e.g., at what points in a sentence a speaker may 'switch' to another language, and some allegedly universal constraints have been formulated. As for the 'free morpheme' and 'equivalence' constraints (Poplack, 1981; Poplack, Wheeler & Westwood, 1987), see Clyne, 1987, Boeschoten & Verhoeven, 1987, Backus, 1989, and Eliasson, 1989.
According to some constraints claimed in the literature, an A-affix would not, for instance, occur after a phonologically unassimilated B-stem. Thus *banof-ta* 'at the station' would be possible, whereas a more reproducing German pronunciation such as [ba:nho:f], typical of the second generation, would render A-suffixing impossible. Counter-examples from many languages show that such alleged constraints just represent tendencies. In fact, word-internal global copies generally do occur more rarely than others. To take care of the exceptions to the 'free morpheme constraint', the notion of 'nonce-borrowing' has been adopted (Poplack & Sankoff, 1988), an auxiliary theoretical concept whose function is 'to protect the original theory from criticism' (Eliasson, 1989), and which leads to some circular reasoning (Boeschoten, 1991).

Global copying in immigrant Turkish is obviously less restricted than these constraints allow. Generally, they do not even pay attention to very different functions of A and B elements in A-based clauses. In fact, some of the rules formulated by Hasselmo (1972) for morpheme orders within mixed complexes (e.g., lexemes with derivational and inflectional elements) seem to be more valid than most constraints claimed later on. In our view, however, the situation cannot be described properly without recognition of the concept of insertion already sketched and the concept of copied combinational patterns to be discussed below.

**Selective copying**

Global copying is primary to all other types. There is, however, also a good deal of selective copying in the sense that only certain aspects of the block serve as the model for imitation. This influence manifests itself as 'loan phonology', 'loan semantics', 'loan syntax', etc. There are, for instance, material, combinational, and semantic features in immigrant Turkish of Germany which owe their existence to German patterns although they do not occur in blocks of German origin.

In the first generation, selective copies seem to appear at a late stage. In the second generation, they are rather common. In some varieties there is even excessive global and selective copying. Since selective copies appear at more advanced stages of acquisition, differences between originals and copies are often less marked, but here adaptation and other kinds of restructuring are possible also.
Haugen characterizes non-phonic copying as 'substitution', as if some phonic B properties had been replaced by A ones. This is misleading, if no global copying has taken place in the concrete case under investigation. Analyses of possible substitution in non-material copying cannot be based on comparisons with originals which also include material aspects. If no whole block - with material properties - has been copied, there are no phonic properties to be replaced. It is sometimes even claimed that lexical 'loan translations' retain their source language shape, but show 'morphemic substitution'. If the term 'substitution' is used for, e.g., phonological adaptation, whereby A-properties are really substituted for B-properties, at least it cannot be used here in the same sense.

**Material copying**

One type of selective copying is an exclusively material one. *Phonic aspects* of B blocks may serve as models for imitation, so that segments and patterns typical of B are copied onto A blocks. Thus diaspora Turkish - especially in non-first generations, which are more familiar with B pronunciation - may acquire distinct phonological structures by copying sounds (such as, in Turkish spoken in Sweden and Norway, the pronunciation of \textit{rt} as a kind of retroflex \textit{t}, e.g., in dör \text{\textquoteleft}four\text{\textquoteleft},) phonotactic patterns (e.g., clusters without any intervening vowel, as [sp] instead of [sip] in spör \text{\textquoteleft}sport\text{\textquoteleft}), or foreign accent patterns of stress and tone. Here, again, differences between original and copy can, in many cases, be explained as adaptation to the phonological system of the 'matrix' code rather than as the result of imperfect learning. On the other hand, we do not, of course, claim that every innovation of this kind is due to code-copying. In the history of Turkic, however, foreign phonic material has often been copied (e.g., form Iranian) and clearly adapted to the phonological systems of the 'recipient' languages (Johanson, 1990).

**Semantic copying**

Selective copying can also be restricted to non-material aspects. Exclusively semantic copying causes changes in content; cf. Standard Turkish \textit{yıldız} \text{\textquoteleft}star\text{\textquoteleft}, which has also assumed the meaning 'famous actor, singer, etc.' under English influence. There may be differences at the denotative or connotative level. The semantics of a Turkish block
may be re-aligned under the influence of a German equivalent, e.g., *altında* 'under' may be used for 'among', influenced by *unter*; or *dur-* for 'to be written', influenced by *stehen*.

### Combinational copying

Copying of combinational properties typical of B blocks onto equivalent A-blocks is manifested by word order divergences, verbs used with unusual complement structures (e.g., *bir kimseyi sor-* 'to ask somebody'; cf. *jemanden fragen*), new rules for lexical subcategorisation, and other phenomena which coincide with German syntax (e.g., number marking: *iki kardeşlerim* 'my two brothers'), including word-internal syntax, e.g., redistribution of morphemic patterns within words. Copied combinability patterns may be more or less generalized and habitualized, for instance, leading to the emergence of new distributional classes (e.g., 'word classes') in A. Thus it is claimed that some Soviet Turkic languages have, on the model of Russian adjective endings, developed corresponding suffix classes. Analytically regarded, the internal combinational pattern typical of a complex B block can also be copied onto an equivalent A unit. Standard Turkish has, for instance, developed internal word-patterns such as *bitkibilim* 'botany' (instead of *bitkibilimi* or *bitki bilimi*). A phrase such as *her ikinci hafta* 'every second week' (instead of *iki haftada bir*) seems to copy properties from *jede zweite Woche*. Traditionally, non-phonetic copies of at least combinational properties are mostly referred to as 'calques'. Semantic-combinational copies (e.g., *çorba ye-* 'to eat soup' instead of *çorba iç-*) are called 'loan translations', but generally only within the lexicon.

Combinational copying may lead to under- or overmarking with respect to functional elements. There may be omission of the genitive suffix of the subject in *lüzum*-constructions under the influence of German *müssen*-constructions, or of the possessive suffix in *dişleri firçaladı* 'he brushed the [= his] teeth' (cf. *er putzte die Zähne*) or in *benim para var* 'I have got money'; cf. German marking of the 'possessor', but not of the 'possessed' in *ich habe Geld* (Pfaff, 1988). On the other hand, the use of the indefinite article *bir* or of pronominals may be extended. In many cases, common Turkish does not spell out anaphoric pronouns for actants whose referents are recoverable from the immediate discourse (so-called 'pro drop' in generativist and crypto-generativist terminology). Some diaspora Turkish varieties seem to be more explicit in this respect.
Also with respect to combinational copying there may be considerable differences between originals and copies, particularly due to adaptation to the A system. Thus some Turkic languages display clauses which seem to be right-branching subordinated complement and relative clauses, provided with finite verbs and introduced by conjunctions and relative elements. However, there are usually great differences between these imitations of Indo-European hypotaxis and their originals because of considerable adaptation to the Turkic systems.

Combinational patterns can be copied onto solid as well as mixed complexes. Thus a mixed complex may assume a B morpheme order. Note that, although the A-coded clausal frame provides the combinational patterns, these can be changed by combinational copying. This leads to syntactic convergence between A and B. It is not less important to notice that, eo ipso, new equivalence positions for possible global copying come into being, an effect which might even be a reason for combinational copying.

Obviously, internal combinational properties also determine the degree of complexity, which means that simplification of a complex A-block may be the result of a copied B-pattern. Even if some of the simplification met with in the second generation, grammatical reduction, reduction of the formal A-inventory (e.g., in the complicated Turkish verb morphology) reflects independent erosion tendencies, it may, at least partly, be due to copying of foreign combinational properties.

Copying of frequency patterns

Even the frequency of use peculiar to a B block may be copied onto an equivalent A-block so that the latter undergoes increase or decrease in frequency of occurrence. Of two stylistic A options, one may be favoured at the expense of the other. This also means that 'rejection patterns' may be copied from B to A. Thus Turkish spoken in Germany seems to exhibit an increased use of plural markers and deictic elements. In solid as well as mixed complexes, combinational patterns, e.g., constituent orders, that already exist in A but are more normal in B may gain ground in A and become less marked. Diaspora Turks may, under foreign influence, increase their use of SVO order, which is admitted but more marked in Turkish. Thus German influence may lead to underdifferentiation: reduced use of the rich word order devices of Turkish. Postpositive complement clauses with finite verbs may be used more frequently, at the expense of the genuine Turkish infinitized types.
based on verbal nouns. Reichl supposes that, in Afghan Uzbek, 'the imitation of the Persian subordinate clause has led to a decrease of participial and gerundival constructions' (1983: 490). Even if the choice of such less synthetic constructions may, as has been claimed, be due to a general tendency towards simplification of grammar, its frequency of use may also be influenced by foreign, e.g., German, subordinative patterns.

Similar shape

As is well known from many language contacts, similarity in shape between an A block and its B equivalent may favour selective copying. The properties copied may be of a semantic nature, as in the case of the relatively homophonous gans 'luck' and Chance, direksiyon 'steering-wheel' and Direktion (Turkish müdürülık), or kontakt 'ignition' and Kontakt. Onto blocks such as [ táksi ], [ p'róble-m ], German accent patterns may be copied: [ táksi ], [ p'róblé-m ]. Similarly, a frequency pattern may be copied, so that Turkish words such as oto and even rare ones like optimal are activated under the influence of Auto and optimal.

Mixed copies

Apart from the 'pure' types of global and selective code-copying, there are also mixed types in the sense that a selective copy of (at least) combinational properties contains one or more global copies.

In Turkish spoken in Germany, we often find mixed copies of the type uban al- 'to take the tube' and krank yaz- 'to report sick', where global copies are used as lexical cores in copied combinational patterns. Within the lexicon, this 'idiomatic' type is often called 'loanblend' (Haugen). We take it, however, to comprise all kinds of mixed global + combinational copying. With regard to diachronic development, a mixed copy often represents a transitory stage between a complex global copy and a purely combinational one, e.g., a B lexeme is copied globally together with some of its combinational rules. Holland-Turkish cases such as vrij al- 'to take off [work]' (cf. Dutch vrij nemen) quoted by Backus (1989: 32), belong to this type. We doubt that this is valid for macht 'a gel- 'to come to power' since here the combinational pattern is already present in Turkish ıktidara gel-. However, as Boeschooten correctly states, in -inan uıtmak hay 'to finish one's relation with'
(cf. *het uitmaken met*), the subcategorisation is 'copied into Turkish' (1991).

In several Turkic languages, loan combinations such as in the postpositive complement clauses already mentioned have been used together with globally copied junctors, e.g., *ki* (*anladım ki gelmez 'I realized she wouldn't come*). However, there are obvious differences between the original combinational patterns and the Turkish replicas, which are subject to several syntactic restrictions (Johanson, 1975). The structural equivalence between *ki* and Indo-European subjunctors is usually questionable. Some investigators have, however, expected the frequency of *ki* constructions to increase in immigrant Turkish, viz. under the influence of subordinated clauses introduced by subjunctors like German *daß*. In fact, such frequency copying has not been verified. One reason for the scarce use of *ki* constructions certainly is that *daß* and similar subjunctors offer no real equivalence positions for it.

**Remodeling of complex blocks**

If we consider the totality of copying devices, we conclude that complex blocks can be remodeled in diverse ways. We often find highly creative formations that presuppose the ability to analyze the B originals, to copy them or parts of them, and to rearrange the copies synthetically. The speaker can use mixed techniques, copying combinational and semantic properties onto A complexes which may also contain global copies, e.g., *kindr kasasi* (*Kindergeldstelle)*. The global copy may retain the allomorphic form it has in the complex B model, even if this model is not copied as a whole, e.g., *şul*, and not *şul* (*Schule*), in the compound *şul binası* (*Schulgebäude*) 'school building'.

Not every solid complex of B etymology must have been copied from B as a whole. The speaker may also use an analytic-synthetic technique, copying a complex block, but replacing parts of it by corresponding global copies known from other B contexts, replacive constituent copies. Thus a B complex originally serving as the model may in fact only be a 'quasi-original'. In *bırotč'n* and *ars kama*, the constituents *bırot* and *ars* are not parts of original copies of *Brötchen* and *Ärztekammer*, but are themselves copies of *Brot* and *Arzt*, i.e., corresponding forms found in other B contexts. In other cases, larger parts of the complex - inflectional endings, articles, pronouns, etc. - may be absent or changed in the final A copy. At least in principle, such creative techniques should be distinguished from the purely material
Code-copying is a normal developmental process and highly prominent in all Turkic languages. Its resultant distinctive speech characteristics may disappear or remain. Momentary copying is the point of departure for habitualization and conventionalization processes. Code-copying starting as performance phenomena may have diachronic effects on the language, i.e., lead to change. Copies may occur frequently, regularly, and even normally. The way from MCC to CCC is a continuum of changes in the sociolinguistic status, of degrees of recurrence in the individual and in the community. Deviations originally perceived as 'interference' phenomena may establish themselves as new sets of norms, and even replace their A equivalents. New systems are created in which conventionalized copies form integral parts. Thus, to account for conventionalization, the existence of separate Alpha grammars must be posited. Even a high-copying variety may become the norm within its group. It then constitutes a socially 'unmarked' Alpha variety and, as such, a new basic code ready to accept further copying. Its clauses serve as matrices for insertion of new copies. Thus, in principle, at every stage of development, the basic code must be defined anew; and
every given new Alpha norm may be deviated from by new 'marked' copying. This means that, for the analysis of current processes, knowledge of previous copying processes and its results is crucial.

Influence of early Alpha

As already mentioned, many phenomena observed in the speech of the first immigrant generations will certainly not be typical of possible German-Turkish varieties in the future. A certain number of global and selective copies will, however, remain. Some types of copying seem to give evidence for ongoing linguistic change. If Turkish survives in Germany and a more general Alpha lect stabilizes, it might rather bear features observed in the speech of the second generation. These features, however, partly emanate from Alpha varieties of the first generation, a kind of 'mother tongues' providing a specific input in addition to the speakers' own German.

This 'double channel' input with two influence layers yields interesting results, for instance, with respect to the material shape of global copies. Some of the elements taken from the first generation may reflect previous stages of B development. The input situation contributes to the complex variational patterns and linguistic uncertainty of the second generation; but it also provides options which can be used for situational and stylistic variation. In any case, phenomena typical of the first generation clearly exert further influence even after the members of that generation have left the arena of linguistic contact.

Integration

In the discussion of 'integration' of code-copies, several variables have played prominent roles. In our view, the analyst should try to specify the degrees of development of a copy along these lines, register correlations between developmental stages reached along different parameters, but refrain from establishing absolute categories which conglomerate values of different variables in obscure and arbitrary ways.

Parameters of structural 'integration' have proved problematic. In spite of all efforts, the boundaries between integrated and non-integrated elements generally remain vague. The crucial difference has even been taken to lie in the speaker's intention rather than in the linguistic structure. Thus, according to Hasselmo, the stretches of speech themselves may be ambiguous, 'although the intention of the speaker may be a
matter of binary choice between code-switching and integration' (1970: 180). In our view, the basic problem arises from the vagueness of the general concept. E.g., 'morphological integration' mostly stands for phenomena essentially different from other kinds of integration. Thus, as already mentioned, inflectional A morphology is normally attached to global copies with their very insertion and cannot serve as a criterion of a more advanced stage of development. However, even with clearer definitional criteria for different kinds of 'integration', it seems dubious whether systematic correlations of a purely structural order can be found.

High degrees of 'integration' with respect to social acceptance, frequency and nature of usage in the community have often been used as criteria for sorting out 'switches'. Other criteria are whether a given copy has replaced A elements and whether it is recognized as A (not perceived as 'foreign'). Not even such symptoms of conventionalization do always coincide with each other. And they are, of course, quite other parameters than the above-mentioned ones concerning linguistic adaptation. Neither a relatively low degree of adaptation nor a relatively low frequency of use excludes that a copy has been conventionalized and become part of a norm. The different kinds of 'integration' should be kept apart, even if some of them turn out to be empirically coincident features. The relationships between different structural stages and extra-structural factors should be studied attentively. To 'explain' copying and the development of copies it will certainly be necessary to pay attention to diverse synchronic, diachronic, socio- and psycholinguistic aspects. However, the categories defined until now on the basis of both social and structural criteria are far from discrete and possess little explanatory power. It is important not only to describe global and selective copying, but also to explore the reasons for, e.g., the actual occurrence of certain copies and the non-occurrence or low occurrence of others. The linguistic modelling briefly outlined in the present chapter only claims to offer an adequate descriptive framework. Descriptive adequacy, however, seems to be a necessary prerequisite for determining the structural as well as the non-structural conditions of code-copying.

Note
Thanks are due to H. Boeschoten and E.Á. Csató for highly valuable comments on an earlier version of this paper.
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