

Werk

Titel: Code-switching and ongoing linguistic change

Autor: Boeschoten, Hendrik; Backus, Ad

Ort: Wiesbaden

Jahr: 1997

PURL: https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797_0001 | LOG_0015

Kontakt/Contact

[Digizeitschriften e.V.](#)
SUB Göttingen
Platz der Göttinger Sieben 1
37073 Göttingen

✉ info@digizeitschriften.de

Code-switching and ongoing linguistic change

Hendrik Boeschoten & Ad Backus

Boeschoten, Hendrik & Backus, Ad 1997. Code-switching and ongoing linguistic change. *Turkic Languages* 1, 41-62.

In the present contribution we discuss findings from our research on Turkish / Dutch code-switching by adolescents in the migrant setting in the Netherlands. We will compare these findings with similar data on Moroccan Arabic / Dutch code-switching. A striking feature in the data under consideration is the frequent occurrence of grammatically reduced stretches of Dutch that are incorporated into basically Turkish utterances. We refer to this phenomenon as “telegraphic switching”, and show that it is not induced by limited L2-competence of the informants. Rather, it seems typical of contexts where the languages are in a sociolinguistically asymmetrical context and the typological distance between them is considerable. We go on to discuss possible future diachronic developments in the light of the code-switching data.

Hendrik Boeschoten & Ad Backus, Tilburg University, Linguistics Department, Postbox 91053, NL-5000 LE Tilburg, The Netherlands.

Introduction

In the present contribution a number of characteristics of Turkish / Dutch code-switching by adolescents will be discussed. The data under consideration have previously been analysed by Backus (1992); they consist of an hour and a half of self-recorded conversation between four twenty-year-old adolescents. The results obtained are compared with the analysis provided by Nortier (1990) of (Moroccan) Arabic / Dutch code-switching, also by adolescents.

The data used here are limited, but we are confident that they provide a good idea of the code-switching patterns that can be expected to arise in conversations among adolescents with a good proficiency in their first and second languages. Backus (1996) shows that the patterns focussed on here are characteristic of the intermediate generation, i.e.

those adolescents who were not born in the Netherlands and had part of their education in Turkey, and part of it in the Netherlands. The real second generation exhibits rather different mixing types. Nevertheless, we want to stress that the level of competence in Dutch of our intermediate generation informants is native-like. It is the way in which the speakers acquire their two languages, not their proficiency in absolute terms, that matters in bringing about code-switching patterns (Backus 1996).

The contact setting involving Dutch and Mediterranean immigrant languages is obviously asymmetrical; Dutch is of course the strongly dominant language in society, while the immigrant languages have only community functions. In this situation, code-switching, likewise, only functions as part of the first language repertoire.

It seems to us that some recurring patterns discussed below are of some consequence for the linguistic modelling of code-switching. The discussion concerns, firstly, the switching of Dutch stretches larger than single words which nevertheless are integrated into Turkish grammatical structures, and secondly, the frequent suspension of grammar that occurs in Dutch intra-sentential switches.

One conclusion drawn by both Backus and Nortier is that frequent switching within sentences appears to be a salient feature of in-group conversation. The percentage of mixed utterances in the speech of Nortiers 11 informants was about 40%, without much individual variation, whereas the relative frequency of Dutch and Arabic monolingual stretches varied greatly, according to the language preference of the individual informants.

In contrast, Boeschoten & Verhoeven (1987) found that the frequency of intra-sentential switching with younger children (aged 4 to 8) was an individual characteristic of the informants. The same can be said about the frequency of (single word) switching by first generation adult immigrants. It is the adolescents growing up in an immigrant environment that provide the social networks for the actuation of verbal behaviour in which code-switching features prominently.

In the following we will focus on insertional code-switching,¹ i.e., the use of Dutch elements in Turkish utterances. Stated differently,

¹ In the linguistic literature "code-switching" is usually employed as a cover term for language mixing phenomena, and we conform to this practice. We are, in

Turkish is the matrix language throughout (cf. Myers-Scotton 1993; our views on the theory proposed in that book are put forward in Backus & Boeschoten 1996). Thus, we view the mixed speech from a synchronic perspective and offer no interpretations in terms of related diachronic processes such as interference and borrowing.

Work on code-switching has been done out of various research interests. From the late seventies on a sharp distinction has developed between sociolinguistically motivated research and work from a theoretical linguistic perspective. Sociolinguists have concentrated on the symbolics and on the discourse functions of the mixing of two (or more) languages. Theoretical linguists made their contribution in the shape of syntactic constraints that were aimed not so much at *explaining* switching points, but rather at formulating *constraints* on switching at certain positions in a sentence. Thus, their emphasis was on intra-sentential switching, while sociolinguists have taken more interest in code-switching at the discourse level. Two influential constraints, held to be universally valid, were proposed in Poplack (1980). The *Free Morpheme Constraint* states that a bound morpheme cannot be from a different language than the root morpheme to which it is attached. The *Equivalence Constraint* prohibits switching at points in a sentence where the surface structures of the two languages involved do not overlap. Other proposals abstract from surface structure by formulating constraints based on, for example, government or subcategorisation restrictions (for a review, see Clyne 1987).

An entirely different concept has been developed by Clyne who noticed that constraints can be overridden in code-switches “triggered” by what he termed “homophonous diamorphs”: forms with interlinguistically similar form and meaning, including cognates and borrowings, which can therefore not be unambiguously assigned to one or the other language (Clyne 1987). The important role triggering plays in bilingual discourse has been attested by various authors, e.g. Muysken (1987).

other words, not claiming that speakers are actually “switching” back and forth from one language to the other. Cf., e.g., Backus (1996) and Boeschoten (forthcoming).

Are we prepared to define “code-switching” in normative terms?

As a general cover-term, code-switching is defined by all authors in similar fashion: “the juxtaposition within the same speech exchange of passages of speech belonging to two different grammatical systems or subsystems” (Romaine 1989: 111, after Gumperz; similar definitions in Muysken 1990: 17, Clyne 1987: 740, among others). However, Poplack (1990: 37) adds a condition to this definition; according to her:

“Code-switching is the juxtaposition of sentences and sentence fragments, each of which is internally consistent with the (...) rules of the language of its provenance” (our emphasis).

Like earlier terminological mix-ups, this one, too, is motivated by certain *intra-sentential* switching types. The fact remains that the use of this definition does not fit the data in many contact settings (e.g., example 1 below), notably for the kind of contact situation discussed presently (cf. Clyne 1987). Thus the question is raised what to do with instances of code-switching which conform to the commonly accepted definition, but fail to meet Poplack’s annex. In this connection, Muysken (1990: 16) raises the issue of so-called “ragged” (i.e., non-constituent) switching. Muysken rather rigidly concludes that these instances could either be treated as exceptions, or should be viewed as evidence for a non-syntactic treatment of code-switching. In fact, one of the two examples (here example 1) cited by Muysken falls into a recurring pattern [$V^a P^a N^d V_{inf}^d$] in Nortier’s study (Nortier 1990: 140, examples 194-196), and therefore certainly does not look like an “exception”. Recall that triggering, too, often leads to the violation of constraints.

- (1) Xess-na m^ca bestuur praten.
 must-we with board talk
 ‘We must speak with the board.’

Another possibility, which we will explore, is to consider at least certain types of ragged switching as evidence for ongoing linguistic change.

In the meantime it has become clear that the (psycho-)linguistic properties of code-switching cannot be studied in isolation from the sociolinguistic setting. But this is not all. As Clyne (1987) has argued con-

vincingly, it makes little sense to dissociate code-switching performance from other effects of language contact, most notably from convergence phenomena (cf. also Johanson 1992). This is one reason why a linguistic analysis of intra-sentential code-switching, based on a naive contrastive analysis for the given contact situation, is to be regarded as methodologically unsound.

Besides, considering the social asymmetry of contact between Dutch and immigrant minority languages, at least in this case it makes little sense to account for a strong tendency towards unidirectionality by formulating post hoc constraints. There is only one instance (out of 230 Turkish / Dutch switches; a triggered switch) for which Backus (1992: 48, example 44) identifies Dutch, and not Turkish, as the matrix language. In some cases mixed utterances are indexed explicitly as Turkish in Backus' corpus. This is prototypically true for nominal sentences. Turkish has zero copula for third person subject. Often an utterance will be indexed for Turkish by function elements (examples 2-4) or by discourse markers (examples 5 and 6).²

- (2) *Box-lar vijfenveertig watt, ama versterker veertig watt.*
'The speaker-s (are) 45 watts, but the amplifier (is) 40 watts.'
- (3) *-Tweeweg mi drieweg mi?*
'(Are) they two-way or three-way?'
-Vierweg.
'(They are) four-way.'
- (4) *Şimdi bu nul komma vijfentwintig.*
'Now, this is 0,25 '
- (5) *Bi dakika, één gedeeld door vier nul komma vijfentwintig.*
'Just a moment, one divided by four is 0.25.'
- (6) *Da's niet te vertalen man! Woordenboek da weerdeloos.*
'You can't translate that, man! The dictionary (is) useless, too.'

² Example 5 is drawn from a data-set collected by Ömer Konak.

In other cases (cf. 6), the clitic conjunction *da / de* is used. Similar linear indexing strategies are discussed by Muysken (1987).

Finally, it seems that certain L_1 -internal conversion patterns inherited from previous contact situations may play an important role. The data may seem disturbing to those who wish to formulate universal constraints. Like the data presented by Clyne (1987), they rather seem to suggest that surface equivalence, dependency relations, X-bar-theory, etc., all play some role in code-switching performance (besides triggering, monolingual conversion patterns, etc.). To try and save the day for one monolithic constraint by labelling deviant patterns as nonce-borrowing (Sankoff, Poplack & Vanniarajan 1986), ragged (i.e., non-constituent) switching, etc., invariably leads to cyclic reasoning.

Specific patterns of intra-sentential switching

From the data on both Turkish / Dutch and on Arabic / Dutch code-switching certain frequently recurring patterns stand out. Remarkably, the frequent patterns are quite different ones in the two cases. In the first place, the distribution of single word switches revealed a striking difference. Whereas the use of single Dutch verbs in Arabic sentences is rare, in Turkish discourse Dutch verbs seem to be freely inserted on the basis of the set conversion formula INF *yap-*. On the other hand, Dutch prepositions seem to be strictly barred from Turkish sentences, whereas they sometimes crop up in the Arabic utterances of Nortier's informants. As Arabic is a prepositional language, just like Dutch, this finding highlights the basic idea behind the "equivalence constraint" (cf. Table 1).

	<i>Arabic / Dutch</i> (Nortier 1990)	<i>Turkish / Dutch</i> (Backus 1989)
N	71%	58%
ADJ	7%	11%
ADV	10%	4%
V	3%	26%
P	2%	—
REST	6%	—

Table 1: Single word switches reported by Nortier (1990: 137) and Backus (1989: 27)

VP switches

Set incorporation patterns for verbs of another language is a common feature of the Turkic languages: some verb with neutralised content ('do') is combined with a verbal noun ("infinitive") of the contact language. The verbs 'do' may be different in different Turkic languages: *qıl-* in Eastern languages (Uzbek, Qirghiz, etc.), *et-* in Western languages (Tatar, Turkish, etc.). However, the contact situation in the Netherlands shows that synchronically not standard Turkish *et-*, but the verb *yap-* is employed for the incorporation of Dutch verbs (and as a word formation device in general, such as in *park yap-* 'to park' and *telefon yap-*; compare also English / Cypriot Turkish *çek et-* 'to check' and *fayilla-* 'to file', Vancı 1991). If the contact language has no infinitive, as in Southern Slavonic languages, this circumstance by no means stands in the way of the integration of switched verbs, because then the present stem is used as a basis for the word formation procedure (for Macedonian verbs in Balkan Turkish, cf. Jašar-Nasteva 1957).

Similar conversion of verbs, employing "do"-verbs, is known from many bilingual contexts and has been discussed at length by Romaine (1989: 123ff.) for Panjabi-English, and by Sankoff et al. (1990) for Tamil / English code-switching. In the Turkish / Dutch case, the link with borrowings from an earlier stage comes to the surface in odd instances like 7 in which the etymologically French loan has taken on Dutch phonetic shape.

- (7) Bunlar bittane şey *organise* yap-mış, *de Diskotheekactie*.
 they a thing (*orɣa.nise.*) do-INFER
 'They have organised something, the "Discotheque Action".'

More interesting than single verb switches are the object + verb switches, which have also been reported for English / Panjabi and English / Tamil code-switching. In the Turkish / Dutch case, the switched pairs are integrated unambiguously into Turkish syntax (examples 8-13). Even in our relatively small corpus, the full range of the marking of number and specificity (i.e., \pm accusative, cf. Johanson 1977) is re-

presented; Dutch articles and plurals never occur in these constructions and are rejected by bilinguals (but they occur elsewhere).³

- (8) *nerede / nerede klacht indienen yap-tınız şimdi?*
 where complaint file do-PRET-2PL now
 ‘Where have you now filed [your] complaint(s)?’
 (...) **een klacht / klachten indienen yaptınız (...)*
- (9) *Türkler also, klant-lar wegjagen yap-ıyor.*⁴
 customer-PL chase do-PROGR
 ‘If he were to take Turks, he chases away customers.’
 (...), **klanten wegjagen yapıyor*
- (10) *Babam-a bir smoes verzinnen yaptık,*
 my-father-DAT a pretext make-up do-PRET-1PL
schoolfeestje var diye.
 ‘We made up a pretext for my father, saying there was a school-party.’
 (...) **een smoes verzinnen yaptık (...)*
- (11) *Bu bisürü taal-lar-ı beheersen*
 he a-lot language-PL-ACC master
yap-ıyor-ken...
 do-PROGR-CONV
 ‘While he is proficient in a lot of languages...’
- (12) *Ben kamer-im-i opruimen yap-ar-ken,*
 I room-POSS1SG-ACC tidy do-AOR-CONV
hepsini geri korum.
 ‘When tidying my room, I put them all back.’
 (...) **m'n kamer / m'n kamer-i opruimen yaparken (...)*

³ Backus (1996: 175) reports one case of a Dutch plural in the syntactic slot under consideration: *Belli bir grenzen überschrijden yapınca...* ‘If one oversteps certain thresholds...’ (meant metaphorically). The interpretation of *grenzen*, which ends in a shwa, as a (Turkish) accusative (*grenz-i*) was rejected by informants.

⁴ Note the counterfactual apodosis */-yor/* (instead of */-ar/*) in 9. The point to be considered here is that code-switching may provide an environment where Turkish semantic rules are somewhat relaxed (cf. also the conditional in example 23).

- (13) *Politiek gesprek-ler-i ophouden yap-in la,*
 political talk-PL-ACC stop do-IMP man!
sorry voor de interruptie.
 ‘Stop the political conversations, man, sorry for interrupting.’

As has been noted before, Nortier (1990) reported that hardly any Dutch verbs were used in Arabic / Dutch switches. Arabic seems to lack conversion formulas of the Turkic and Indo-Aryan (including Tamil as an areal feature?) type.

The intuitions of native speakers and researchers seem to concur in assuming that prefixing with aspect + person would be the “normal” way to integrate Dutch verbs into Arabic (Nortier 1990:178), just as it has been reported for French / Arabic code-switching (Bentahila & Davies 1983). But in her actual corpus, Nortier seems to have found periphrastic structures with ‘do’-verbs to be the predominant (though still infrequent) pattern.

Adjectives used attributively and adverbally

One rule of Dutch seems to work in [Adj N]-switches:⁵ the agreement rule for the adjective (a schwa, spelled *-e*, is added to attributive adjectives, except if the head noun is neuter and indefinite, compare 14 and 15; cf. also Backus 1992:55):

- (14) O *blond-e meisje afstuderen yapti.*
 that blond-AGR girl get-degree do-PRET
 ‘That blond girl got (her) degree.’
- (15) *Engels-i bir tane blond meisje-dan aliyordun.*
 English-ACC a blond girl-ABL take-IMPERF-2SG
 ‘You got the English (lessons) from a blond girl.’

⁵ Adj / noun switches do not occur very frequently in the data-set, thus reflecting a well-known distributional feature of code-switching data in general. Fortunately, the agreement pattern discussed presently is borne out by the new data presented in Backus (1996, e.g. examples on pp. 156, 174, 190).

Moroccan Arabic would require an article following the demonstrative *dak*).

- (20) *dak* stoplicht
'that traffic light'

After all, what is not there cannot be simplified. Muysken (1987) applies the term "suspension of grammar" to switches apparently lacking syntactic cohesion. Apart from article deletion, this type of switches seems to be relatively scarce in the Arabic / Dutch code-switching investigated by Nortier, and doesn't form a discernible pattern, apart maybe from a certain tendency for subordination with empty COMP (as in 21 = Nortier 1990: 132, example 166) and the use of adverbial (Dutch) PP's without preposition (as in 22 = Nortier 1990: 135, example 175).

- (21) *Één minuut nog niet weg, kan* l-bulis u ka-yduzu.
one minute yet away not
'They had not left one minute (when) the police-officer passed by.'
- (22) Weq^{at} li-ya *lagere school*.
'It happened to me (in) primary school.'

The frequency of occurrence of these patterns is not very high, however (3 cases without and 20 with complementizer, and 3 cases without preposition vs. 6 with, respectively).

The Turkish / Dutch data offer a somewhat different picture here. Switches between clauses look well-formed, although the matter is difficult to judge because of the low frequency of occurrence (cf. 23 and 24).

- (23) *Güzel yemek pişiriyor-sa, dan zouik wel komen*.
'If she cooks a nice meal, then I would come.'
- (24) *Kun je zo zien hé, öyle student ol-duğ-u-nu*.
thus be-VN-POSS3SG-ACC
'You can see immediately, can't you, that she is just a student.'

The type of object clause seen in 24 is especially interesting, and warrants further investigation: our impression is that the order of main and

subordinate clause is not reversible (while both orders would be permitted in both Turkish and Dutch). The interjection *hé* could be an instance of flagging, i.e., an element signaling that a switch is coming.

On the other hand, apart from single word switches and the patterns discussed above, the Turkish / Dutch switching patterns look irregular. Many of these switches involve the absence of a (Dutch) preposition / (Turkish) postposition, as in 25. Here, by the way, the tag *biliyon mu* indexes a Turkish sentence, with zero copula. Another type, with the object pronoun dropped, is represented by 26.

- (25) *Zestien programma programmeerbaar*, biliyon mu?
 ‘(It is) programmable (with) 16 programmes, you know?’
- (26) Bugün *laat* oldu ya, yarın *krijg je*
 today late become-PRET PRTC tomorrow get you
misschien, *maandag*.
 may-be monday
 ‘Today it has grown late, tomorrow you may get (it), on Monday.’

If the syntactic integrity of switched sequences is accepted as a criterion for “legitimate” code-switching, the Turkish / Dutch switching patterns look decidedly odd; they are asymmetrical in that they maintain the integrity of the Turkish syntax, but not of the Dutch. Nor can the structure of the Dutch switches be related in general to the level of L₂ proficiency of the informants. Besides, relatively sophisticated rules of Dutch like adjective agreement and verb placement in second position (e.g., 26) are in fact exhibited by the code-switching patterns.

To us it looks as if the data reflect a certain telegraphic (in the sense of “reductionist as to function elements”) sloppiness, i.e., contain an implicit reference to fuller structures; to illustrate this we offer a series of further examples:

- (27) Benim saçım niye *spoel* biliyon mu? (for: (...) *gespoeld* oluyor (...))
 ‘Do you know why my hair is being *rinse(-d)*?’
- (28) Babam bana kızıyor, biliyor musun, eve geç gelince, *wordt boos man*.
 ‘My father gets angry with me, y’ know, if I come home late, (*he*) gets *angry, man!*’

- (29) Bir tane *donkere jongen*-nan, *donker değil de bruine huidskleur*.
'With a *dark boy*, not *dark* but (*having a*) *brown skin*.'
- (30) Yoksa *box*-tan mı, *dicht bij elkaar*, ondan mı?
'Or from *the speaker(-s)*, (*which are*) *close to each other*, is that why?'
- (31) Bakıyor ki *uitgaan* yapıyorlar, meselâ *uit eten*.
'He sees they are *going out*, for instance, *out for dinner*.'
- (32) Türkiye'de partilerde tapanca dasımak *mag wel*.
'In Turkey (*it is*) *O.K.* to carry guns with political parties.'
- (33) Politiek essahtan *reet interesseren* yap-ıyor.
'Politics really does(*n't*) *interest (me)* a *fucking bit*.'
(Dutch: ...*interesseert me geen reet*, i.e., even the negation is lacking)

We assume that this telegraphic switching mode has originated for three reasons: (1) The switches reflect previous stages of L₂ development of the informants and of others. Consider, for instance, the conventionalised use of Dutch modal verbs as modal particles, exemplified by 32. In fact, *moet* 'must' is one of the few Dutch forms which can safely be assumed to have been integrated as a loanword into the Turkish of (some of) the first generation immigrants (Boeschoten & Verhoeven 1985). (2) The switches serve to avoid problems with surface structure equivalence, the lack of which would block code-switching almost totally if the speakers minded Poplack's rules (suspension of grammar as a "neutrality strategy", cf. Muysken 1987). To take one example, in 29 *bruine huidskleur* functions as a PP, but contains neither a Dutch preposition, nor a Turkish postposition. This may explain to a certain extent the fact that in Arabic / Dutch code-switching the syntactic integrity of Dutch stretches is upheld to a much greater extent: the surface structures of Dutch and Arabic are more equivalent; in particular, both languages are prepositional. It is not surprising that the one common case of reduction found by Nortier (1990) was the frequent deletion of articles before Dutch nouns. Moroccan Arabic and Dutch differ in their use of determiners. (3) The code-switching mode forms part of the Turkish repertoire. Hence the one-sidedness of the "suspension of grammar".

It could be argued, on the other hand, that reduced structures are simply features of any spoken language. Thus, 31 seems to match the similarly reduced, but quite acceptable, Dutch utterance *Hij ziet dat ze uitgaan, bijvoorbeeld uit eten*. For the kind of reduction illustrated by example 33, on the other hand, it is inconceivable to think of any sort of monolingual equivalent.

Special considerations for asymmetric code-switching

The diachronic dimension

One problem with many linguistic studies of code-switching is that they tend to treat the languages involved in the contact situation as invariant, or even take only standard languages into account. Clyne (1987) argues against the legitimacy of this procedure and claims that code-switching cannot be studied in isolation from other contact phenomena, in any case not in the context of immigration communities. Many minority languages show some measure of syntactic convergence towards the dominant language of the country of immigration. This may happen more easily in English / Dutch and English / German contact than in the case of Turkish / Dutch and Arabic / Dutch contact. But, as was pointed out before, code-switching in an immigration context such as the one discussed here can be expected to form an integral part of the minority language repertoire, and is therefore precisely one of the realms of performance through which the language changes. Most importantly, the code-switching mode itself changes. For a recently established immigrant community language, a model of ongoing change is needed (we find support for this position with Clyne 1987 and Nortier 1990: 208; cf. also Nartey 1982 on another bilingual situation judged to be unstable).

Constraints and neutrality strategies

In describing and interpreting the data, we view constraints as tendencies, not as universal rules governing synchronic performance. Clyne (1987:761) concludes from his data:

“Our data suggest that the structural-integrity / equivalence constraint applies, but only if we accept that the syntax of the two language systems may already have converged through transference, and even when it is violated by syntactic convergence at the point of code switching”.

We take this reasoning to be open to inversion, say:

“Syntactic convergence takes place, among other things, in order to create equivalence sites for code-switching”.

Syntactic convergence may thus result from (one of) the neutrality strategies presented by Muysken (1987).

The structure encountered in Turkish / Dutch code-switching can be summarized as follows:

Syntactic integrity is only preserved at the clausal level. This also means that the clause is the level at which language indexing takes place.

Dutch clauses are normally monolingual; the major exception seems to be the occasional switching of adverbial clauses (cf. example 24). In other cases, Dutch auxiliaries appear to be integrated into Turkish as loanwords (with shift of word-class; e.g. example 32).

Within Turkish clauses, Dutch grammar is suspended in Dutch multi-word stretches; this interpretation naturally has implications for a theory of lexical insertion.

The situation encountered seems to imply that lack of typological surface equivalence (i.e., generally speaking, neither in the sense of “syntactic integrity” as formulated by Sridhar & Sridhar (1980), nor in the strict sense of linear word order) does not inhibit code-switching, but leads to massive application of neutrality strategies. On the other hand, the Dutch rule of adjective agreement seems to be strictly observed. Turkish and Dutch both have [Adj N] order, which means that there is no problem with surface equivalence. But this is as far as it goes, since the absence of NP’s without agreement is *not* predicted. Dependency-related constraints (like the government constraint) must be invoked to show how in this particular type of NP’s, Turkish determiners can somehow trigger a Dutch rule of agreement. How exactly this can be

done is not yet clear.⁶ The situation is less clear for Dutch / Arabic switching. Although Nortier (1990) finds none of the syntactic constraints validated, she also rejects the notion of syntactic simplification. As Clyne (1987) indicates, it makes little sense to discuss the present type of code-switching solely in terms of universal constraints. The constraints must be studied in their relationship with neutrality strategies.

Triggering and language change

Triggering offers a more constructive way to get around the lack of equivalence. We can hardly expect the kind of syntactic convergence described by Clyne for languages with phonetically similar function elements to occur in contexts involving typologically and genetically distinct languages. Instead, triggering set off by content words may eventually result in entirely new phrase structures. For example, in examples 1 and 12 the Dutch nouns (*bestuur*, *kamer*) are cultural borrowings⁷ (cf. for example Myers-Scotton 1993: 169). As such, they can be considered part of the Arabic and Turkish lexicons, and, being cognates shared with Dutch, are therefore potential trigger sites. In the examples, Dutch verbs are triggered on the basis of the Dutch collocations *met het bestuur praten* and *kamer opruimen*. In a sense this would result in specific rules for code-switching separate from the rules of the monolingual modes. But in effect, in the asymmetrical case of code-switching these new rules may eventually form part of local varieties of the immigrant languages. One candidate would be the type of ragged switch in 1; the other examples in Nortier (1990: 140) also look as if they may well have been triggered. In these switches the lack of equivalence which results from the requirement that verbal complements must be tensed in Arabic, is circumvented.

As another example, let us consider PPs in Turkish / Dutch code-switching. PP-switching mostly involves idiomatic phrases (Backus 1992: 55-56). In earlier cases, Dutch grammar was suspended, as in 34 (Boeschoten & Verhoeven 1987):

⁶ Example 24 (with COMP indexed for Turkish) also seems to run counter to the government constraint.

⁷ In the case of *kamer*, the context of the utterance is connected with student life, in which *kamer* has the specific connotation of a room rented by a student.

- (34) *op oog gözlük var.*
 on eye glasses there-is
 ‘On (her / the) eye(s) there are glasses.’

This constraint on PP-switching contrasts heavily with the conventionalised PPs involving Tajik prepositions followed by Uzbek case-marking found in Uzbek dialects in Afghanistan (Boeschoten 1983), as in 35-37:

- (35) *misli bizdi bayrâ-y-îmîz-dey*
 like our flag-POSS1PL-COMPER
 ‘like our flag-like’
- (36) *tâ sinp-i šaš-gača*
 till class six-TERM
 ‘until grade six-until’
- (37) *dar zamân-ê Dawud u Zâiri bulardê waxtiga*
 in time-of and they-GEN time-POSS3-LOC
 ‘in the time of Dawud and Zahir... in their time’

The (etymologically) Tajik prepositions obligatorily govern case. Exactly the same type of duplication has been found in Northern Tajik dialects, i.e., the type leads to the same type of convergence in the several balanced bilingual contact situations between Uzbek and Tajik that prevail in Central Asia. The point is that duplication with Dutch prepositions is categorically rejected by bilingual native Turks; nevertheless it seems that it may occasionally result from triggering. Example 38 is one of the five cases attested by Backus (1992, 1996: 345):

- (38) *Je moet naar een Türk ev-i-ne bak-acağ-in.*
 you must to a Turk(ish) house-POSS3-DAT look-FUT-2SG
 ‘You have to look at a Turkish house.’
- (39) *Mutta se oli kidney-sta to aorta-an*
 -from -to
 ‘But it was from the kidney to the aorta.’

We speculatively assume that the category of prepositions has found its way into Uzbek as a consequence of triggering. Come to think of it, couldn't the duplication in the Finnish / English switch 39 (Muysken 1987) result from triggering, too?

Access to the lexicons

The interpretation offered so far raises miscellaneous questions about lexical access and borrowing. Most importantly, if we reconsider the verb + object switches in Turkish it seems that the Dutch lexicon is accessible not only for single words, but also for lexical subcategorisation. That is, we reject for the present data the model laid down by Romaine (1989: 130, cf. also fig. 4.4), who denies "constructions such as *exams pass kërna* any special syntactic or semantic status in bilingual discourse". In the examples cited above, verb + object seem to form idiomatic units; the switches ensuing could be termed compound nonce borrowings.

- (40) Çalışıp ta ne yapacağın, sen de *vrij* al.
 'What are you going to do working, you take off, too.'
 (*vrij nemen* -> *vrij al*-)

A variation on this theme is the semi-calque exemplified by 40; note that the verbs involved here are highly frequent in both languages which may facilitate synonym-matching between the Dutch and Turkish lexicons.⁸

A second point which comes to mind is the relation between telegraphic switches and borrowing. Compare 41, in which the subcategorisation for PP-complement is copied into Turkish, with 42, in which it is not (cf. also the German-Turkish switch 43, cf. Pfaff, Kardam & Voss 1989: 70).

⁸ Another example we cited in an earlier version is the following: *Ecevit macht'a gelecekti, öyle mi?* 'Ecevit was going to grasp power, isn't it?' (*aan de macht komen* -> *macht'a gel*-). Johanson (1993: 215) rejects this interpretation and prefers an equation with Turkish *iktidara gel*-. He might be quite right here, but the issue seems unresolvable on a descriptive basis. As such, this illustrates a typical methodological problem of contact linguistics.

- (41) O diyor, ben *uitmaken* yap-tım kız-ınan, *zou dé kloppen?*
 finish do-PRET1SG girl-with
 ‘He has finished (his relation) with the girl, would that be true?’
 (Dutch *het uitmaken met X* ‘finish one’s relation with X; note that the dummy *het* has been dropped)
- (42) *Politiek* *gesprek-ler-i* *ophouden* yap-ın la,
 political talk-PL-ACC stop do-IMPman!
sorry voor de interruptie.
 ‘Stop the politics conversations, man, sorry for interrupting.’
 (Dutch *ophouden met X* ‘stop (doing) X’)
- (43) Ama *ınhölüsünü* *heiraten* yapıyor.
 but corpse-POSS3-ACC marry do-PROG
 ‘But ... she marries his corpse.’

We suppose that 42 is restructured out of the grammatically stripped syntagma *gesprek ophouden yap-*. On account of the apparent conventionality of the verb + object switches we would not, *mutatis mutandis*, automatically accept the shift of subcategorisation as evidence for the integration of *ophouden* as a borrowing. On the other hand, further integration of these borrowings can result in a reflection of successive levels of L₂-proficiency in the individual or over generations. Compare cases like Polish reflexive verbs borrowed into Karaim, a Turkic language: *straccet-* ‘make an effort’ (Polish *starać się*, with phonetic reflection of the clitic), vs. *bavcet-* ‘have a good time’ (Polish *bawć się*, with the clitic dropped; Wexler 1983: 35).

Inherited accommodation facilities

Nortier (1990) and Muysken (1990) have pointed out the importance of a language’s linguistic contact experience, previous to that under investigation (i.e., contact with French and Spanish as colonial languages in the case of Moroccan Arabic). Normally, one would expect contact-induced structural properties of the language to be rather peripheral in the system. Indeed, neither the dropping of Dutch articles in single word switches, nor the single verb switches reflect the patterns found in (Moroccan) Arabic / French code-switching. But Turkish (like many other languages) has a fully productive word formation device for the accommodation of verbs from any language. On the other

hand, the data from Turkish / Dutch code-switching seem to suggest that a borrowed form like the complementizer *ki* in 44 has only peripheral status in the spoken varieties under investigation: the equivalence site offered by it is not exploited.

- (44) Birdenbire anladım *ki* o bana anam kadar yakındır.
 'I suddenly realised *that* she is as close to me as my mother.'

Thus, if we consider the role of existing patterns in the inherited loan periphery of language in code-switching, we also have to spot the patterns which, like the integration scheme for French verbs in Moroccan Arabic in the case of Arabic / Dutch code-switching, seem to play no role, and explain that fact. Similarly, explanations for non-occurrence of switches which would be allowed for by universal constraints would also be very important (Muysken 1990).

Conclusion

In models for code-switching phenomena to be encountered in recently established immigrant communities with strongly dominated community languages, universal constraints are bound to play a less important role than is suggested in the literature for relatively symmetrical language contact situations. A descriptively adequate handling of the data leads one (a) to emphasize the importance of non-syntactically motivated surface-phenomena such as triggering, and (b) to call for a diachronic approach. In immigrant contexts, code-switching basically forms part of the immigrant's linguistic repertoire. It seems that typological closeness between the minority language and the dominant language leads to rapid one-sided convergence (Clyne 1987), and that typological distance leads to a type of intra-sentential code-switching in which L_2 -grammar is mostly suspended in L_1 -structure. In the latter case, (future) restructuring leads to conventionalised code-switching structures which may form an integral part of the minority language in question at future stages.

References

- Backus, A. (1989). *Codewisseling onder Turkse jongeren in Tilburg*. [MA thesis, Tilburg University.]
- Backus, A. (1992). *Patterns of language mixing. A study of Turkish-Dutch bilingualism*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Backus, A. (1996). *Two in one. Bilingual speech of Turkish immigrants in the Netherlands*. Tilburg: Tilburg University Press.
- Backus, A. & Boeschoten, H. (1996). Review article of: 1. C. Myers-Scotton 1993, *Social motivations for codeswitching*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 2. C. Myers-Scotton 1996, *Duelling languages*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 6, 129-153.
- Bentahila, A. & Davies, E. E. (1983). The syntax of Arabic-English code-switching. *Lingua* 59, 301-330.
- Boeschoten, H. (1983). *Ösбекisches aus Aibak (Samangan)*. Utrecht University, Department of Turcology.
- Boeschoten, H. (forthcoming). Code-switching, code-mixing and code-alternation: what a difference. To appear in: R. Jakobson (ed.) *Codeswitching as a worldwide phenomenon II*. Berlin: Mouton / De Gruyter.
- Boeschoten, H. & Verhoeven, L. (1985). Integration niederländischer lexikalischer Elemente ins Türkische: Sprachmischung bei Immigranten der ersten und zweiten Generation. *Linguistische Berichte* 98, 347-364.
- Boeschoten, H. & Verhoeven, L. (1987). Language mixing in children's speech: Dutch language use in Turkish discourse. *Language Learning* 37, 191-215.
- Clyne, M. (1987). Constraints on code-switching. How universal are they? *Linguistics* 25, 739-764.
- Jašar-Nasteva, O. (1957). Vlijanieto na makedonskiot jazik vrz albanskite i turkskite govori vo Makedonija. *Makedonski Jazik* 8, 147-164.
- Johanson, L. (1977). Bestimmtheit und Mitteilungsperspektive im türkischen Satz. *Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, Supplement III / 2, 1186-1203.
- Johanson, L. (1992). *Strukturelle Faktoren in türkischen Sprachkontakten*. Stuttgart: Steiner.

- Johanson, L. (1993). Code-copying in immigrant Turkish. In: Extra, G. & Verhoeven, L. (eds.) *Immigrant languages in Europe*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 197-221.
- Lehtinen, M. (1966). *An analysis of a Finnish-English bilingual corpus*. [Ph.D. Thesis, Indiana University.]
- Myers-Scotton (1993). *Duelling languages*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Muysken, P. (1987). Neutrality in code-mixing. In: *Eigen en Vreemd: Handelingen van het 39e Filologencongres Amsterdam*. Amsterdam: Vrije Universiteit.
- Muysken, P. (1990). Concepts, methodology and data in language contact research. In: *Papers for the Workshop on Concepts, Methodology and Data*. Strasbourg: European Science Foundation, 15-30.
- Nartey, J. N. (1982). Code-switching, interference or faddism? Language use among educated Ghanians. *Anthropological Linguistics* 24, 183-192.
- Nortier, J. (1990). *Dutch and Moroccan Arabic in contact: Code switching among Moroccans in the Netherlands*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Pfaff, C. & Kardam, F. & Voss, J. (1989). *Natürlicher bilingualer Spracherwerb von Kita-Kindern. Vom Krippenalter bis zu den ersten Grundschuljahren. Arbeitsbericht III: Verbalmorphologie*. Berlin: Freie Universität.
- Poplack, S. (1980). Sometimes I'll start a sentence in English y termino en español. *Linguistics* 18, 581-616.
- Poplack, S. (1990). Variation theory and language contact: concepts, methods and data. In: *Papers for the Workshop on Concepts, Methodology and Data*. Strasbourg: European Science Foundation, 33-66.
- Romaine, S. (1989). *Bilingualism*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Sankoff, D. & Poplack, S. & Vannirajan, S. (1990). The case of the nonce loan in Tamil. *Language Variation and Change* 2, 71-101.
- Sridhar, S. & Sridhar, K. (1980). The syntax and psycholinguistics of bilingual code-mixing. *Canadian Journal of Psychology* 34, 407-416.
- Vancı, Ü. (1991). Cypriot Turkish: Some empirical observations. Paper read at *5th Turkish Linguistics Conference*, London, 1990.
- Wexler, P. (1983). Is Karaite a Jewish language? *Mediterranean Language Review* 1, 27-54.