

Werk

Titel: Linguistic and cultural innovations in the Turkish spoken in New York City: Langu...

Autor: Koban , Didem

Ort: Wiesbaden

Jahr: 2010

PURL: https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797_0014 | LOG_0030

Kontakt/Contact

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

✉ info@digizeitschriften.de

Linguistic and cultural innovations in the Turkish spoken in New York City: Language and cultural contact

Didem Koban

Koban, Didem 2010. Linguistic and cultural innovations in the Turkish spoken in New York City: Language and cultural contact. *Turkic Languages* 14, 192–205.

This paper examines calques and new combinations that have emerged in the speech of Turkish speakers living in New York City as a result of prolonged contact with American culture and American English. This study is based on a corpus of calques extracted from speech data obtained from interviews conducted with six first-generation and seven second-generation speakers ranging in age from 20 to 55 years. The data also include unrecorded speech. The findings with regard to the linguistic innovations may provide evidence for language-contact influence from English on Turkish, that is, the lexical knowledge of Turkish speakers living in New York City may have undergone changes during the contact between the two languages. The findings regarding the use of cultural innovations can be attributed to cultural contact in that the informants have become less dependent on the word association in Turkish and express themselves in English-like ways.

*Didem Koban, Hacettepe University, Faculty of Education, Department of Foreign Languages Education, English Language Teaching, Beytepe, Ankara, Turkey.
E-mail: dkoban@hacettepe.edu.tr*

1. Introduction

Before we deal with the effects of English on the use of Turkish, a brief look at the Turkish immigrant population living in the U.S. may be in order here. According to Karpat (2004), the first pattern of Turkish immigration to the United States started in the 17th century followed by a second pattern of migration from the 1820s until 1920. It was estimated that over 1.2 million people, consisting of Muslims and ethnic Turks, emigrated from the Ottoman Empire to North America. Between 1948 and 1980 up to twenty-five thousand Turkish people including doctors, engineers, and other technicians came to America for training. A significant number of Turks returned to Turkey; however, many people, students in particular, stayed permanently in the United States to obtain graduate degrees and were offered important positions in U.S. academia, industry and business management. It was also reported that since the 1970s, the number of Turkish immigrants has risen to more than 4,000 per year.

According to the U.S. Census (2006), there are an estimated 500,000 Turks living in the United States. The largest Turkish communities can be found in Paterson,

New Jersey, and New York City (i.e. Brooklyn and Staten Island). This being the case, the presence of language and cultural contact is inevitable in the above-mentioned areas of the United States where the largest Turkish immigrant communities exist.

As is well known, the coexistence of speakers of different languages temporally and spatially as a result of immigration, wars, or colonialism leads to the emergence of two types of contacts, which can be distinguished by their outcomes. The first type, *language contact*, happens when languages spoken by bilingual or multilingual speakers interact causing innovations in the grammar of a language and usually resulting in language change over time. On the other hand, *cultural contact*, a high degree of contact between cultures, leads to innovations in linguistic usage that do not necessarily affect the grammar of a language. The purpose of this study is to describe some of the implications of both types of contact. This paper examines the extent to which the Turkish language spoken in New York City (NYC) differs from the Turkish spoken in Turkey, by examining calques and new combinations that have emerged in the speech of first and second-generation Turkish speakers living in NYC as a result of prolonged contact with American culture and American English. Whereas this topic has been extensively analyzed in many studies conducted in Europe, namely in Germany, Netherlands and Norway, it has received much less attention in the U.S., particularly in NYC.

This paper will be organized as follows: Section 2 briefly reviews the calquing phenomena. Section 3 describes the informants, followed by the data collection procedure in section 4. Section 5 presents the calques and new combinations found in the Turkish spoken in NYC. Finally, section 6 offers a discussion of the findings and goals for a further study.

2. Theoretical framework

2.1. Linguistic innovations: Word calques

Linguistic borrowing, one of the most studied consequences of language contact has been discussed in numerous theoretical frameworks and under a variety of different terms. Scholars have proposed several labels such as *borrowing* (Haugen 1950, Thomason & Kaufman 1988, Thomason 2001, Appel & Muysken 1987), *interference* (Weinreich 1953, Muysken 2004), and *code-copying* (Johanson 1993). Bloomfield (1933) referred to this phenomenon as *cultural borrowing*. (Note that in this paper, the language that provides the model for the word and phrasal calques will be called the donor language and the language in which the calques occur will be called the recipient language). Linguistic borrowing has been defined as the adaptation of forms, meanings, or forms and meanings from the donor language into the phonemic system, morphology, syntax and lexicon of the recipient language. Linguistic borrowing usually begins with lexical items, but significant structural changes also occur with more intense cultural contact.

In language contact studies and in particular in studies on immigrant bilingualism, there is a wide range of different labels and concepts employed to describe the changes that affect single words. One type of change concerns the borrowing or transferring of only the meaning of a single word from a donor language into a recipient language. In other words, it is the meaning that is borrowed rather than the lexical item itself. Scholars have referred to this phenomenon as *loanshift* (Haugen 1950), *semantic extension* (Weinreich 1953), *semantic borrowing* (Ullman 1957), *calqueward* (Otheguy, Garcia, & Fernández 1989), *semantic copying* (Johanson 1993), *single-word calque* (Silva-Corvalán 1994) and *calque translation* (Daiuta 1984). A review of the literature shows that this process involves some kind of translation and that the existing items in the recipient language undergo significant changes of meaning. According to Daiuta (1984), calquing affects not only the meaning and distribution of words of the recipient language, but also creates additions to the lexical inventory, changes the way certain words co-occur with each other and increases or decreases the frequency of occurrence of certain words.

A model that has served as an important framework for various studies on Turkic languages influenced by non-Turkic languages was provided by Johanson (1993). His theoretical framework, the code-copying model, is based on the idea that an element of a language, which serves as a model, is copied into a second language. The author distinguishes between two types of copies, *global* and *selective*. Global copying involves copying of elements as a whole with all their structural properties, whereas selective copying is copying of only certain structural properties of elements in the donor language onto the elements in the recipient language. The author further discusses several types of selective copying: *Semantic* and *combinational*. In semantic copying, the meaning or usage of a foreign equivalent is used with the native word, also referred to as *semantic extension*. In combinational copying, a foreign word combination is used in the recipient language, using the native words. This is often referred to as loan translation, which will be discussed in the following sections. Throughout this paper, I will use the term *word calque* to refer to the former process.

Examples of word calques are evident in many studies. In the work of Silva-Corvalán (1994), Spanish speakers living in the U.S. extended the meaning of *parientes* ‘relatives’ to incorporate the meaning of *parents* in English. Spanish speakers living in the U.S. also transferred one of the senses of English *play* into Spanish *jugar* (Otheguy & Garcia 1988). This can be seen in (1) where the Spanish word *jugar* is used with the meaning of playing a musical instrument. This meaning is found in the English word *play*, but not in the word *jugar* in non-contact Spanish. In the displayed examples, all word calques are underlined.

Spanish spoken in the U.S.

- (1) *Cuando no tengo nada que hacer, juego música para oírla.*
 ‘When I don’t have anything to do, I play music to listen to it.’

Many examples of word calques in Turkish can be found in a variety of studies conducted in Europe. For example, in the speech of German-Turkish bilinguals living in Germany, the Turkish verb *var* ‘to go’ acquired the meaning of *übergehen* ‘to change’ in German. In (2), *var* appears where speakers of non-contact Turkish would use the Turkish verb *geç* ‘to switch’.

Turkish spoken in Germany

- (2) *Almanca konuşuyorsak, ondan sonra Türkçeye varıyoruz.*
 German speak:PROG.COND.1PL then Turkish:DAT go:PROG.1PL
 ‘If we speak German, then we switch to Turkish.’ (Boeschoten 1994)

Also, the Turkish word *saat* ‘hour’ in (3) replaced *ders* ‘lesson’ on the basis of the usage of *Stunde* ‘hour’ with the meaning of *lesson* in German.

Turkish spoken in Germany

- (3) *Mesela Judo için bir saat var.*
 For example, Judo for one hour exist
 ‘For example, there is one hour for judo.’ (Boeschoten 1994)

With respect to the bilingual Turkish immigrants living in Norway, word calques are analyzed within the mixed Matrix Language (ML) + Embedded Language (EL) construction (Türker 1999). Within the Matrix Language Frame Model, the language that plays a dominant role is called the matrix language (ML) and the language from which elements are taken and inserted into an ML framework is called the embedded language (EL). According to Türker (1999:119), the EL element that is inserted into the ML frame “instigates” semantic extensions. The following examples illustrate the framework used here:

Turkish spoken in Norway

- (4) *Hamarda Vikingshipte skøyterde durduk.*
 Hamar:LOC Vikingship:LOC skate:DAT stand:PAST.1PL
 ‘We stood on skates in Hamar, at the Viking ship.’ (Türker 1999)

In the example above, the Norwegian word *skøyter* ‘skate’ is an embedded element inserted in the Turkish structure. Instead of saying *skøyter yap-* ‘to do skating’, which would be used in non-contact Turkish, the Norwegian-Turkish bilinguals say *skøyterde dur-* ‘stand on skates’ because Norwegians say *a stå på skøyter* ‘to stand on skates.’ Based on the examples above, Türker (1999) concluded that the existence of the embedded element *skøyter* was the reason why Turkish speakers extended the meaning of the verb *dur-* ‘to stand on’ to *yap-* ‘to do’.

2.2. Linguistic innovations: Phrasal calques

In some cases, linguistic changes may occur also at the phrase level. Some phrases may contain semantically extended component/s. Scholars referred to such phrases as *loan translations* (Weinreich 1953), *multiple-word calques* (Silva-Corvalán 1994), and *phrasal calques* (Smead 2000). I will use the term *phrasal calques* to refer to such phrases. For instance, in Canadian French, *escalier de feu* is modeled on English and means ‘fire staircase’ or ‘fire escape’. In this phrase, *feu*, in fact, was semantically extended and replaced *incendie*, which speakers of non-contact French would use (Weinreich 1953).

Backus (2010) also defines such phrases as those that are reproduced as more or less literal translations from one language into another. They are also evident in his work. An example is given in (5).

- Turkish spoken in the Netherlands*
 (5) *Suçu bana verdi.*
 Guilt:ACC I:DAT give:PF.3SG
 ‘He accused me.’

Backus notes that the combination of the noun ‘guilt’ and the verb ‘give’ is not used in the Turkish spoken in Turkey, but has been used commonly in the Turkish spoken in the Netherlands. Similarly, in (6) Spanish-English speakers extended the meaning of *tiempo*, which means ‘time that lasts’ in non-contact Spanish to incorporate the concept of one specific point in time, ‘an occasion’, ‘an hour’ or ‘a moment’ due to the influence of English.

- Spanish spoken in the U.S.*
 (6) *Es un modo de tener un buen tiempo.*
 It’s one way to have a good time
 ‘It’s one way to have a good time.’ (Silva-Corvalán 1994)

2.3. Cultural innovations: New combinations

In some cases not only linguistic innovations but also cultural innovations may occur. The innovations, which were referred to as *multiple-word calques that do not alter semantic and/or grammatical features* (Silva-Corvalán 1994) and *unusual combinations of words* (Otheguy 1993), can be seen at the phrase level. Cultural contact plays a role in the rise of phrases that are new as combinations formed with lexical items in the recipient language and formed in a way that does not affect the grammar of the recipient language. Otheguy (1995: 219) defined such phrases as “familiar, linguistically unremarkable phrases that happen to express a communicative innovation carried out by members of the borrowing culture in imitation of the source culture”. As the definition suggests, bilingual speakers use these kinds of phrases because cultural contact is very intense, speakers are assimilated into the

culture of the donor language, and this has an effect on the way they express certain concepts. Speakers do not create new words; rather they use words from the recipient language, and the meaning of an expression in the recipient language is conveyed in a way that is communicated in the donor language. What usually leads to the emergence of such phrases is the increased frequency of the usage of phrases in the donor language (Heine & Kuteva 2005). For example, German speakers living in northern Italy say *das Bündel von Trauben* 'the bunch of grapes' modeled on Italian *il grappolo d'uva*, instead of *das Traubenbündel* 'the grape bunch' which would be used in non-contact German.

Such phrases are exemplified also in the Spanish spoken in the U.S. Some examples are *Dias de semana* 'weekdays' instead of *Dias de trabajo* in standard Spanish; *Maquina de contestar* 'answering machine' instead of *Contestador automatico*, and *patio de juegos* 'playground' instead of *patio de escuela* (Silva-Corvalán 1994). The use of *Dia de dar gracias* in contact Spanish calqued on English *Thanksgiving Day* (Otheguy 1995) also serves as an example.

Examples are also evident in the speech of Turks living in Germany. For example, instead of *calışma masası* 'work table' in standard Turkish, the Turkish-German bilinguals living in Germany use *yazma masası* 'writing table' (Boeschoten 1994). Similar types of usages such as *yarım sene* 'half a year' instead of *altı ay* 'six months', which would be used in standard Turkish have been recorded also in the speech of Norwegian-Turkish bilinguals living in Norway (Türker 1999). As all the above examples illustrate, the grammatical structure of the languages concerned is not affected.

3. Informants

As mentioned before, the aim of this study is to provide an analysis of word and phrasal calques found in the Turkish spoken in NYC. The data were collected via face-to-face interviews from a total of thirteen Turkish speakers who were currently living in NYC at the time of the interview. The 13 subjects included five females and eight males and ranged in age from 20 to 55 years. Seven interviews were conducted with second-generation speakers born in the U.S., and six interviews were conducted with first-generation speakers who were born in Turkey but came to the U.S. before the age of 12 and were exposed to English for the first time in the U.S. The first-generation speakers had minimal or no knowledge of the English language when they first arrived in NYC. Three first-generation speakers arrived in NYC at the age of four, one at the age of eight, and two when they were 11. They had lived in NYC for at least 30 years. Almost all first-generation speakers were from İstanbul, Turkey. One informant was from Ankara.

4. Data collection procedure

I used the social network approach (Milroy 1980) when collecting the data. The advantage of such an approach, according to Milroy, is that it is easier to enter a

speech community and meet more speakers within the social networks of one's contacts. Accordingly, I made contact with most of the informants through my friends via e-mail and phone to find out if they would be interested in participating in my study. Since most of the speakers knew my friends, they were willing to participate in the study. The informants I interviewed introduced me to their spouses and friends. Since the speakers in NYC were very busy, some of the interviews were conducted on the phone and some of them in the informants' offices.

Before the interviews, I had informed the speakers that everything, including their names, would be confidential. Some informants were very interested about the nature of my study. When they asked me what my research was about, I tried not to give a lot of information to the informants about the purpose of my study since it could have affected their speech. According to Labov (1972), if speakers become aware of the fact that their speech will be used for a study, they are likely to use more formal speech. This can result in data that are not representative of the speakers' natural speech.

Labov also found that speakers pay less attention to their speech when they talk about emotional topics. Following Labov, I asked my informants to talk about a positive event that had an important effect on their lives. Nevertheless, some informants were more willing to tell me their life histories. Some other topics that the informants talked about were movies, TV series, their children, jobs and favorite vacations. I asked the speakers to talk about one of the topics giving as many details as they could and told them that I would not interrupt them throughout the interview. When the speakers finished talking about a topic, I asked them to talk about another topic in detail. Following the interview sessions, the informants' speech was transcribed.

The interviews were not less than 30 minutes. The informants were told that they were participating in a linguistic study but were not told that this study investigates calques and new combinations in Turkish. The data also included unrecorded speech taken from other first and second-generation speakers living in NYC.

In the following sections, I will analyze two categories of calques and new combinations as they are evident in the Turkish spoken in NYC and discuss their importance. In order to determine whether or not calques in our data also exist in the Turkish spoken in Turkey, we referred to the electronic version of *Türk Dil Kurumu (TDK)* 'Turkish Language Association'.

5. Calques in NYC Turkish

5.1. Linguistic innovations: Word calques

I begin this section by presenting examples of word calques taken from my own observations and from the interviews I conducted with first and second-generation Turkish speakers living in NYC. The examples taken from my observations are

listed below, where the word calques are shown in italics. Note that I am reporting in this paper the most frequently used word calques.

- (7) *Lord and Taylor'da o parfümü taşıyorlar.*
 Lord and Taylor:LOC that perfume:ACC carry:NEG.PROG.3PL
 'They do not carry that perfume at Lord and Taylor.'
- (8) *Evi ajan gösterdi.*
 House:ACC spy/agent show:PF
 'The spy/agent showed the house.'
- (9)a. *İş nasıl gidiyor?*
 Work how go:PROG
 'How is work going?'
- b. *Meşgul*
 'Busy'.

What is linguistically innovative about the words in italics is that due to the influence of English, the general meanings of the words are semantically extended to incorporate the meanings of English words. In (7) *taşımak* 'carry' is extended to incorporate the meaning of *yok* 'non-existence'; in (8), the noun *ajan* 'spy' is used with the meaning of *komisyoncu* 'real estate agent,' and in (9b), *meşgul* 'busy' acquired the meaning of *yoğun* 'intense'.

The following examples present the word calques, which are taken from the interviews conducted with first and second-generation speakers. The first number in parenthesis at the end of each narrative identifies the informant as first or second generation; the letter identifies the informant as male or female and the numbers provide his or her age. The following narrative is taken from the speech of a first-generation speaker who talked about his job. The informant had been living in NYC for 36 years.

- (10) a. *İnsanlarla konuşma ve geçinme benim iyi parçalarım.* (1M40)
 People:3PL.INS talk:INF and get along:INF I.POSS good part:3PL.GEN
 'Talking with people and getting along with them are my strengths.'
- (10) b. *İtalya hem güzeldi hem de aynı zamanda bazı parçaları güzel değildi.* (1M40)
 Italy not only nice:PC but also same time:LOC some part:PL.GEN
 nice NEG-PC
 'Italy was nice but at the same time some of its parts were not nice.'

In (10a), the informant extended the meaning of the word *parça* 'piece' in *benim iyi parçalarım* to accommodate the sense of *strength* in English. In (10b), the same informant once again used *parça* 'piece' with the meaning of 'place' in English.

Another word calque that has been commonly used in the data is the word *kağıt* ‘paper’ to incorporate the meaning of *document* or *form* in English. In (11), the informant extended the meaning of *kağıt* ‘paper’ to refer to *belge* ‘document’ in English.

- (11) *Hatta ben Türk vatandaşlığından çıkmaya çalıştım,*
 Even I Turkish citizenship:GEN.ABL get out:INF.DAT try:PF.1SG
ama olmadı, bir sürü kağıtlar istediler. (1M40)
 but be:NEG.PF many paper:3PL want:PF.3PL
 ‘I tried to give up the Turkish citizenship but it did not happen. They asked for a lot of documents.’

In (12), a second-generation speaker was talking about the fact that her sister read a lot of books. She used the word *kalite* ‘quality’ to refer to *özellik* ‘characteristic’ when she compared herself to her sister.

- (12) *Bende o kalite yok.* (2F26)
 I:LOC that quality non-existent
 ‘I do not have that characteristic.’

Finally, the example in (13) is taken from the speech of a first-generation speaker who was talking about the fact that he knew a lot of people. He used the word *bağlantı*, which means ‘connection’ to incorporate the concept of *tanıdık* ‘contact’, which would be used in general Turkish.

- (13) *Yani çok o kadar bağlantım var ki* (1M37)
 I mean very so connection:GEN existent that
 ‘I mean I have so many connections.’

5.2. Linguistic innovations: Phrasal calques

In addition to the word calques, the speech of Turks also contains phrasal calques that incorporate one or more word calques. The use of word calques in phrasal calques, according to Smead (2000), results in the creation of new collocations. The following examples are taken from my own observations. The patterns, in particular those in (15) and (16), seem to be quite prevalent in the speech of both first and second-generation Turks in NYC.

- (14) *Sözünü kırma.*
 Promise:GEN.ACC break:NEG
 ‘Don’t break your promise.’

- (15) *A trenini al.*
 A train:ACC.GEN take
 'Take the A train.'
- (16) *Telefonumu kaçırdım.*
 Telephone:GEN.ACC miss:PF.1SG
 'I missed your call.'

Three different characteristics can be noted regarding the phrasal calques above. First, although the words in the phrases are translated from the English equivalents, the phrases still follow the unmarked word order for Turkish. Second, the verbs *kırmak*, *almak* and *kaçırmak* seem to be semantically extended to accommodate the meanings of the English equivalents. In (14), the meaning of *kırmak* 'to break' is extended and replaces *tutmak* 'hold', which would be used in the Turkish spoken in Turkey. In (15), *almak*, which means 'grab, take or move something or someone from one place to another' is extended and replaces *binmek* 'get on'. In (16), Turkish speakers in Turkey would use *telefonu yetiştirememek* 'not to be able to answer the phone on time' instead of *telefonu kaçırmak* 'to miss a phone call'. It can be said that these phrases are semantically transparent only to Turkish speakers who are familiar with American English and American culture. Some other examples of this type of calquing can also be seen in the speech of other first and second-generation speakers.

- (17) *Orda olman gerekebiliyor bir sürü kağıtları*
 There be:INF.GEN have to:PSB.PROG a lot of paper:3PL.ACC
doldurmak için. (1M40)
 fill out-INF for
 'You have to be there to fill out a lot of papers.'

In (17), *kağıt* 'paper' is used with the meaning of *form* 'form' in English. In standard Turkish, one would use *form doldurmak* 'fill out a form' instead of *kağıt doldurmak* 'fill out a paper.' Other examples of phrasal calques with word calques are:

- (18) *Ankara operasında iş aldı.* (1M55)
 Ankara opera:LOC job take:PF
 'He took a job at the Ankara opera house.'
- (19) *Bir iş teklifi geldi ve onu aldı.* (2F26)
 One job offer:ACC come:PF and it:ACC take:PF
 'A job offer came up and he took it.'

In (18) the first-generation speaker extended the meaning of the word *almak* 'buy' to accommodate the meaning of *girmek* 'enter'. Here *almak* does not refer to 'to buy, take or get' rather it refers to 'becoming an employee'. The general tendency in the

Turkish spoken in Turkey is to use *işe girmek* and not *iş almak*. The same form is also utilized by a second-generation speaker in (19).

5.3. Cultural innovations: New combinations

As mentioned earlier, cultural contact plays a role in the creation of new phrases in which words do not undergo any changes of meaning. Such phrases or combinations, which are modeled culturally on American English do not necessarily affect the grammar of Turkish but certainly lead to changes in the usage of Turkish. It can be said that they involve change in the arrangement of lexical items already existing in the recipient language in accordance with the way they are typically combined in the donor language. The corpus in this study contains a few of those forms. The use of *plaj evi* ‘beach house’ instead of *yazlık ev* ‘summer house’; *Üçüncü ve dördüncü kuzenler* ‘third and fourth cousins’ instead of using only *kuzenler* ‘cousins’; *Türk insanlar* ‘Turkish people’ instead of using only *Türks* ‘Türkler’; *uluslararası arkadaşlarımız* ‘international friends’ instead of *yabancı arkadaşlarımız* ‘foreign friends’ are some examples taken from the speech of different second generation speakers.

- (20) *Plaj evim var.* (2F28)
 Beach house:GEN existent
 ‘I have a beach house.’
- (21) *Onlarla Los Angelesda, benim üçüncü ve dördüncü kuzenlerimle tanıştım.* (2F28)
 They:INS.PC.1PL Los Angeles:LOC, I:1SG.POSS third and fourth
 cousin:3PL.GEN.INS meet:PF.1SG
 ‘We were with them in Los Angeles, with my third and fourth cousins.’
- (22) *Türk insanlar geliyordu.* (2M35)
 Turkish people:PL come:PROG.PC
 ‘Turkish people were coming.’
- (23) *Uluslararası arkadaşlarımız vardı.* (2F33)
 International friend:3PL.GEN existent:PC
 ‘We had international friends.’

6. Conclusion and discussion

The purpose of this paper was to illustrate and provide an analysis of calques and new combinations found in the speech of Turkish speakers living in NYC and to investigate the extent to which Turkish spoken in NYC has differed from the usage and grammar of the Turkish in Turkey.

The findings with regard to the linguistic innovations may provide some evidence for language-contact influence from English on Turkish. The fact that word

calques are in evidence in our corpus indicates that the lexical knowledge of Turkish bilingual speakers living in NYC may have undergone changes during the contact between the two languages. Since most of the informants are dispersed in the Manhattan area, where they work for foreign companies and have to use English on a daily basis, they are likely to be influenced by English. This finding is in line with that of Veltman (2000) who examined the process in which immigrants living in the U.S. came to adopt English. Veltman found that immigrants learn English very rapidly and adopt it as their primary language. In fact, in the long run, the high rates of language shift to English result in the abandonment of minority languages. Veltman shows this to be true for all minority language groups in the U.S.

Veltman (2000) also found that the use of English by immigrants declines progressively with increasing age at the time of arrival. In other words, the older the immigrants at the time of arrival, the less likely they are to speak English predominantly. His results showed that immigrants between the ages of five and nine at time of arrival in the U.S. adopted English at a rate of more than 65 percent. This rate dropped to 40 percent for immigrants who came to the U.S. between the ages of ten and 14 and to 25 percent for those who were aged 15–19 when they arrived in the U.S. The reason for this decline, according to Veltman, is that immigrants who arrive in the U.S. at an early age have more opportunities to use English on a daily basis. For example, younger immigrants receive most of their schooling in the U.S. In addition, younger arrivals are more receptive to the influence of English as their first language skills are not fully developed by the time they arrive in the U.S. However, it is not possible in the present state of our knowledge to determine whether there is a relationship between age of arrival and the use of word and phrasal calques as the data are not evaluated in terms of potential differences due to this factor.

The findings regarding the use of cultural innovations can be attributed to cultural contact. Since the Turks living in NYC have been using English and have been exposed to it in many different domains, it may be that as a result of the frequent use of English, the informants have become less dependent on the word associations in Turkish and therefore express themselves in English-like ways.

These results make it possible for a clear picture to start to emerge regarding not only the role of English in general but the specific ways in which Turkish usage appears to be Anglicized in NYC. Note that lexical analysis is especially difficult using recorded corpora of this kind because the relevant items tend not to occur frequently. Therefore, it is hard to tell whether the examples illustrated in this paper are actually established usages. These usages may be in fact language-internal innovations (Backus 2010). According to Backus, this, however, may not be so. Speakers probably use these forms because the items are associated with the culture of the donor language. Backus refers to this diachronic result as contact-induced change in the form of a new combination of existing words, a new multiword unit. He further adds that to the extent that there are many people who have had enough exposure to the donor language, the usages may well have become established forms in the mi-

nority language. Similarly, Smead (2000: 166) notes that “a rise in frequency or a change in preference which parallels English usage may be attributable to language contact”.

Nevertheless, further research should be conducted with more informants to see whether the forms that we have observed in the speech of bilingual Turks will also appear in the speech of other Turks. According to Backus (2010) what would also be helpful is speakers’ judgments on the frequency of use and/or acceptability of certain words in the Turkish spoken in NYC because we cannot be sure whether the synchronic data that we have provide any evidence for the diachronic status. Yet, based on the examples we provided it seems reasonable to conclude that the new usages contribute to the creation of a variety of Turkish which is quite different from the Turkish varieties spoken in Turkey.

References

- Appel, René & Muysken, Peter 1987. *Language contact and bilingualism*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Backus, Ad 2010. The role of codeswitching, loan translation and interference in the emergence of an immigrant variety of Turkish. *Corpus-based linguistics and language education* 5, 225–241.
- Bloomfield, Leonard 1933. *Language*. New York: Holt.
- Boeschoten, Hendrik E. 1994. Second language influence on first language acquisition: Turkish children in Germany. In: Extra, Guus & Verhoeven, Ludo (eds.) *The cross linguistic study of bilingual development*. Amsterdam: North Holland. 253–263.
- Daiuta, Amy 1984. Remarks on calquing. *City University of New York Forum* 10, 70–90.
- Haugen, Einar 1950. The analysis of linguistic borrowing. *Language* 26, 210–231.
- Heine, Bernd & Kuteva, Tania 2005. *Language contact and grammatical change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Johanson, Lars 1993. Code-copying in immigrant Turkish. In: Extra, Guus & Verhoeven, Ludo (eds.) *Immigrant languages in Europe*. Clevedon & Philadelphia & Adelaide. 197–221.
- Labov, William 1972. Some principles of linguistic methodology. *Language in Society* 1, 97–120.
- Milroy, Lesley 1980. *Language and social networks*. Baltimore, MD: University Park Press.
- Muysken, Peter 2004. Two linguistic systems in contact: Grammar, phonology, and lexicon. In: Bhatia, K. Tej & Ritchie, William (eds.) *The handbook of bilingualism*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers. 147–169.
- Otheguy, Ricardo & Garcia, Ofelia 1988. Diffusion of lexical innovations in the Spanish of Cuban Americans. In: Ornstein-Galicia, Jacob & Bixler-Márquez, Dennis (eds.) *Research issues and problems in United States Spanish*. Brownsville, Texas: Pan American University. 203–242.
- Otheguy, Ricardo, Garcia, Ofelia & Fernández, Mariela 1989. Transferring, switching and modeling in West New York Spanish: An intergenerational study. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 79, 41–52.

- Otheguy, Ricardo 1995. When contact speakers talk, linguistic theory listens. In: Contini-Morava, Ellen & Goldberg, Sussman B. (eds.) *Meaning as explanation: advances in linguistic sign theory*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 213–242.
- Silva-Corvalán, Carmen 1994. *Language contact and change: Spanish in Los Angeles*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Smead, Robert N. 2000. Phrasal calques in Chicano Spanish: linguistic or cultural innovation? In: Roca, Ana (ed.) *Research on Spanish in the U.S.* Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press. 162–172.
- Thomason, Sarah G. & Kaufman, Terence 1988. *Language contact, creolization, and genetic linguistics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Thomason, Sarah G. 2001. *Language contact*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Türker, Emel 1999. *Codeswitching and loan translations*. In: Brendemoen, Bernt & Lanza, Elizabeth & Ryen, Else (eds.) *Language encounters across time and space*. Oslo: Novus Forlag. 111–123.
- Ullmann, Stephen 1957. *The principles of semantics*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- U.S. Census 2006. *American community survey, total ancestry reported*. <http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/DTable>. Retrieved 2010-04-22.
- Veltman, Calvin 2000. The American linguistic mosaic: understanding language shift in the United States. In: McKay, Sandra L. & Wong, Sau-Ling (eds.) *New immigrants in the United States*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 58–95.
- Verhoeven, Ludo (ed.) 1993. *Immigrant languages in Europe*. Clevedon, Philadelphia & Adelaide: Multilingual Matters Ltd. 197–221.
- Weinreich, Uriel 1953. *Languages in contact*. The Hague: Mouton de Gruyter.

Abbreviations

1SG	first person singular	GEN	genitive
1PL	first person plural	LOC	locative
3PL	third person plural	POSS	possessive
PL	plural	NEG	negative
INF	infinitive	PROG	progressive
INS	instrumental	PF	perfective aspect
ACC	accusative	PC	past copula
ABL	ablative	COND	conditional
DAT	dative	PSB	possibility