

Werk

Titel: Complement Clauses in the Turkish variety spoken by Greek-Turkish bilingual child...

Autor: Kaili , Hasan; Çeltek , Aytaç; Georgalidou , Marianthi

Ort: Wiesbaden

Jahr: 2012

PURL: https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797_0016 | LOG_0015

Kontakt/Contact

Digizeitschriften e.V.
SUB Göttingen
Platz der Göttinger Sieben 1
37073 Göttingen

✉ info@digizeitschriften.de

Complement Clauses in the Turkish variety spoken by Greek-Turkish bilingual children on Rhodes, Greece

Hasan Kaili & Aytaç Çeltek & Marianthi Georgalidou

Kaili, Hasan & Çeltek, Aytaç & Georgalidou, Marianthi 2012. Complement Clauses in the Turkish variety spoken by Greek-Turkish bilingual children on Rhodes, Greece. *Turkic Languages* 16, 106–120.

This article deals with the use of different kinds of complement clauses in the Turkish variety spoken by Greek-Turkish bilingual children on Rhodes, Greece. We examine the reason(s) of the profound use of VO Finite-type Complement Clauses in the speech of the children. Based on the analysis of our data, we claim that extensive usage of the structures under discussion is due to copying from Greek in regard to prolonged and intense contact and/or incomplete acquisition.

Hasan Kaili, Department of Mediterranean Studies, University of the Aegean, 1 Dimokratias str., 85100 Rhodes, Greece. E-mail: kaili@rhodes.aegean.gr

Aytaç Çeltek, Department of Mediterranean Studies, University of the Aegean, 1 Dimokratias str., 85100 Rhodes, Greece. E-mail: celtek@aegean.gr

Marianthi Georgalidou, Department of Mediterranean Studies, University of the Aegean, 1 Dimokratias str., 85100 Rhodes, Greece. E-mail: georgalidou@rhodes.aegean.gr

1. Introduction

Recent research has shown that in numerous distinct cases language contacts have played an important role in the change of local Turkish varieties. In very different regions of the world, Turkish has been in contact with several languages of different typology (Demir & Johanson 2006: 2); therefore, studies on language contact between Turkish and other languages have currently increased (Boeschoten & Johanson 2006, Doğruöz & Backus 2009, Johanson 2000, 2002a, Matras 2009, among many others). In this context, the present study will focus on structural changes that have occurred due to contact between Turkish and Greek on Rhodes, Greece. Preliminary research on the properties of Rhodian Turkish (henceforth RT), the variety under study, has revealed substantial *copying* from Greek (Georgalidou et al. forthcoming, Çeltek & Kaili forthcoming). In the present study, we will focus on the structures of complement clauses and, in particular, we will deal with the question of which structural features of complement clauses in RT are in the process of changing under the impact of Greek.

2. The community

The present-day Greek-Turkish bilinguals (henceforth GTBs) on Rhodes are Greek citizens of Turkish origin whose ancestors first settled on the island after 1522, as subjects of the Ottoman Empire. During the Italian occupation (1912–1943), they were recognized as a religious community and after the annexation of the Dodecanese islands to Greece in 1947, they became Greek citizens. They were not deemed as covered by the *Treaty of Lausanne*, but special status was acknowledged as far as the *Vakf* and the schools were concerned. The teaching of the Turkish language was *de facto* abolished in 1972 (Tsitselikis & Mavrommatis 2003: 9). Nowadays, the estimated population of GTBs is about 2500–3000 people on the island of Rhodes. In this particular sociolinguistic situation, Turkish has acquired the status of a minority language whereas Greek is the language of the majority of the population.

Older speakers (80+) of the community under investigation, who are fluent in the local variety of Turkish, also use a *contact vernacular* (in the sense of Winford 2003: 236), which is based on the local Greek dialect of Rhodes with substantial interference from Turkish (Georgalidou, Spyropoulos & Kaili 2011). Later generations speak a variety of Greek with less interference and are inclined to use Greek more, so as to become fully functional members of the Greek-speaking community. Very often, Turkish (family and heritage language) remains the home language, while the children are educated in monolingual Greek state schools. As a consequence, in the last 65 years, almost the entire bilingual community has shifted from near monolingualism in Turkish to bilingualism in Turkish and Greek. Owing to the attendance of monolingual state schools, which introduce children to literacy in Greek from a very early age, almost all members of the third generation (community members younger than 30) exhibit preference for Greek. As for Turkish, they exhibit different levels of competence (Georgalidou, Kaili & Çeltek 2010). They acquire Turkish at home and they do not participate in any formal literacy practices in Turkish. As a result of the decreased use of Turkish and the systematic *copying* (Johanson 2002a, 2006) of lexical and structural patterns from Greek, each upcoming generation gets reduced input, which may cause “incomplete acquisition in specific grammatical areas, depending on age and level of grammatical attainment” (Montrul 2008: 120).

3. Language Contact

3.1. Theoretical framework

Language contact, in the simplest sense, is the use of two or more languages in a linguistic community at the same time (Thomason 2001: 1). As shown by many studies in the field, when two or more languages are spoken by groups of speakers in the same geographical area over a long period of time, they influence one another (Weinreich 1953, Thomason & Kaufman 1988, Thomason 2001, Johanson 2002a, Winford 2003, Heine & Kuteva 2005). However, predicting the outcome of a language contact situation has been a very challenging task (Siemund 2008: 3) as it

varies depending on the length and intensity of the contact. More specifically, the social factors of language contact which also include the respective sizes of the linguistic communities involved and the power relation between the communities (Winford 2003: 2) play a crucial role on the linguistic outcome of the contact situation. Following Winford, we see the dominant language, in terms of size and power, as the *source language* and the subordinate one as the *recipient language* (2003: 12).

In addition to social factors, linguistic factors also determine the outcomes of language contact, among which the degree of typological similarity between the languages involved (Thomason & Kaufman 1988: 73, Winford 2003: 2). According to Thomason, typologically different languages need more intense contact for the borrowing of structures (2001: 71). What Thomason refers to as 'borrowing' is one of the terms that has been used to explain linguistic procedures triggered by contact which are also traditionally referred to as *transfer*, *interference*, *importation*, *calquing*, *copying*, etc. However, as Johanson convincingly claims (2002a: 8, 2000: 88), the source language does not lose the borrowed element, therefore borrowing is really a kind of copying, and the metaphor "borrowing" is hardly appropriate. According to Johanson (2006: 7), copying never means direct transfer of elements from code to code, but always implies linguistic creativity. Following Johanson (2006), we will adopt the term 'structural copying'¹ to refer to the use of a structure from the source language, in this case Greek, in our analysis of complement clauses in RT.

3.2. Structural factors in Turkic language contact²

The recipient language may copy a number of features of the source language. It may acquire new elements in lexicon, phonology, morphology, syntax, pragmatic organization, etc., mostly substituting them for native elements (Johanson 2002b). As far as syntactic or structural copying is concerned, to minimize the difference between their languages, bilingual speakers manipulate the syntax of the relevant languages in various ways. As Gardner-Chloros indicates "where a bilingual speaker's two languages share a common syntactic structure, the speaker will tend to use that common structure rather than any alternative ones which fulfill the same function but do not exist in both languages" (2008: 56). In this study we refer to this 'tendency' as *preference*, because the bilingual speakers mostly exhibit preference for the common structure(s) over the alternative one(s).

Concerning the structures that are the subject matter of the present discussion, by the influence of a source language, Turkic languages prefer abandoning left-branching subordinative constructions with nonfinite elements, which form a significant typological feature of Turkic languages. The reduction or elimination of nonfinite constructions means a certain simplification of the inflectional systems (Johanson

1 For a detailed discussion about the terms borrowing and copying see Johanson (2002b).

2 Copied from the title of the seminal monograph of Lars Johanson (2002a).

2006: 18). Examples of infinitive reduction include a number of Turkic varieties, strongly influenced by Indo-European languages, e.g. the dialect of Turkish spoken in the Balkans, Turkish spoken in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia³ [Macedonian Turkish] (Matras 2009), Gagauz (Menz 2006), and West Rumelian Turkish (Johanson 2006). All these varieties adapt the prevailing pattern of finite marking of the modal complement clause. In FYROM Turkish, for example, infinitive construction disappears almost entirely, and in its place an existing finite option is generalized (Matras 2009: 249). According to Johanson, however, before concluding that Turkish has copied word order patterns of the source language, one must take into account the variational possibilities already present in the Turkish word order system (2002a: 111). In Turkish, there are deviations from SOV order in order to fulfill certain pragmatic functions. Johanson also adds that this kind of variation in Turkish can facilitate the foreign influence especially when analogous features are involved (2002a: 112). In this respect, in RT, the extensive use of SVO order together with right-branching complement constructions and finite elements irrespective of pragmatic functions can be explained by the influence of prolonged contact with Greek, which is essentially a SVO language. In a similar way, under Slavic influence, Gagauz has copied right-branching patterns with clauses based on finite predicates that are introduced by conjunctions (Menz 2006). Instead of using a complementizer like *da* in Macedonian, *na* in Greek and *te* in Romani, Turkish, in contact with Indo-European languages, makes use of its rich inflectional potential and assigns optative mood to the subjunctive position (Matras 2009: 249), with the exception of Gagauz, which usually introduces complement clauses as postpositive finite clauses by means of *ani* 'where' and Turkish spoken in FYROM, which uses the junctor *ki* only for factual complements of verbs of cognition, utterance and perception (Johansson 2006:18-19).

In the context of this discussion, the aim of our study is to investigate the types of complement clauses mostly preferred by the GTB children on Rhodes. While in standard Turkish there is a robust coexistence of finite and non-finite complement clauses, Greek makes use of only finite type complement clauses. We argue that as a result of long and intense contact with Greek, GTB children in Rhodes make extensive use of the finite complement clauses instead of the predominant non-finite complement clauses despite the fact that they do exhibit good command of these structures.

4. Complement Clauses

Complement Clauses (CCs) are "sentential structures that function as an argument of a matrix verb. The complement clause can occupy the subject argument slot or the

³ Henceforth Turkish spoken in FYROM.

object slot” (Kidd, Lieven & Tomasello 2005: 50). In this study we will only deal with those that occupy the object slot.

In most languages, there are two distinct types of CCs: The (F)inite and (N)on-(F)inite type complements. “Languages which lack complement clause construction, on the other hand, are likely to employ some other construction type as a complementation strategy” (Dixon 2006: 6).

As we will see below, there are cases in which although a language possesses some kind of complement clause construction, it may also employ some other complementation strategy.

4.1. Complement Clauses in Turkish

Although the non-finite (NF) type of CCs is regarded as the predominant subordination strategy, in Standard Turkish there is actually a robust coexistence of finite (F) (i.e. identical in structure to a full sentence) and non-finite (NF) (i.e. with their verbal constituent marked by one of the subordinating suffixes *-mak*, *-mA*, *-DIK*, *-(y)AcAK* or *-(y)Iş*) CCs (Göksel & Kerslake 2005, Kerslake 2007). Examples (1-4) below are NF type of CCs.

- (1) *Ali kitap oku-mak istiyor*
 Ali book read-INF want-PROGR.3SG
 ‘Ali wants to read a book’
- (2) *Ali kitap okuma-yı sev-iyor*
 Ali book read.VN-ACC love-PROGR.3SG
 ‘Ali likes to read books’
- (3) *Ayşe ben-im kitap okuma-m-ı ist-i-yor*
 Ayşe I-1SG.GEN book read-VN-1SG.POSS-ACC want-PROGR.3SG
 ‘Ayşe wants me to read book(s)’
- (4) *Deniz’in dün sinema-ya git-tiğ-i-ni duy-du-m*
 Deniz.GEN yesterday cinema-DAT go-VN-3SG.POSS-ACC hear-PST-1SG
 ‘I heard that Deniz went to the cinema yesterday’

The (F) category can be further divided in (i) the bare-F CCs with either the use of a verb in the imperative/optative mood in the CC when the superordinate clause expresses volition (5)

- (5) *Çocuk anne-si-ne yardım et-sin iste-di*
 child mother-3SG.POSS-DAT help-IMP.3SG want-PST.3SG
 ‘The child wanted to help his/her mother’

or with the use of a verb in the indicative mood, when the CC is interrogative and the superordinate clause expresses cognition (6)

- (6) *Ahmet nere-ye git-ti bil-mi-yor-um*
 Ahmet where-DAT go-PST.3SG know-NEG-PROGR.1SG
 'I don't know where Ahmet went'

and (ii) the bare-sub-Final CCs with a preceding *ki* or a following *diye* or *gibi* (when the verb of the main clause is *gel-*) *sub*(ordinator) (Göksel & Kerslake 2005: 404) (7–9).

- (7) *Duy-du-m ki dün okul-a git-me-miş-sin*
 hear-PST.1SG ki yesterday school-DAT go-NEG-EV-2SG
 'I heard that you didn't go to school yesterday'
- (8) *Konser bit-ti diye duy-du-m*
 concert end-PST.3SG diye hear-PST.1SG
 'I heard that the concert ended'
- (9) *Bana yemeğ-I beğen-me-di-n gibi gel-iyor*
 I.DAT food-ACC like-NEG-PST-2SG gibi come-PROGR.3SG
 'It seems to me that you didn't like the food'

Another way of complementation in Turkish is the noun clause known as small clause (when we have a verb of perception/cognition as the verb of the main clause) (Göksel & Kerslake 2005, Özsoy 2001) (10–12).

- (10) *Herkes ben-I yat-tı san-dı*
 everyone I-ACC go to sleep-PST.3SG think-PST.3SG
 'Everyone thought (that) I went to sleep'
- (11) *Biz sen yat-tı-n san-dı-k*
 we you go to sleep-PST.2SG think-PST.1PL
 'We thought (that) you went to sleep'
- (12) *Herkes ben-I yat-tı-m san-ıyor*
 everyone I-ACC go to sleep-PST.1SG think-PROGR.3SG
 'Everyone thought (that) I went to sleep'

Finally, when the predicate of a main clause is a certain motion verb like *git-*, *gel-* (in a purposive function) we may also have the so-called serial verb constructions (SVCs) (Roussou 2006) (13–14). All types of CCs above, with the exception of those formed with *ki* and the SVCs, are clauses which are regularly embedded in other clauses (thus, OV).⁴

⁴ For an analytic account of CCs in Turkish cf. Göksel & Kerslake (2005), Kerslake (2007).

- (13) *Ali git-ti yat-ti*
 Ali go-PST.3SG go to sleep-PST.3SG
 'Ali went to sleep'
- (14) *Gel otur*
 come-IMP.2SG sit-IMP.2SG
 'come and sit'

4.2. Complement Clauses in Greek

Unlike Turkish, CCs in Greek are introduced by one of the subordinators *oti*, *pos*, *mipos*, *pu* or the particle *na* (the subjunctive marker). They all contain a finite-type verb and follow the word order of a main clause that is VO (Holton, Mackridge & Philippaki-Warbuton 1997, Roussou 2006) (15–18).

- (15) *Nomizo oti/pos les psemata*
 think.IMP.1SG SUB tell.IMP.2SG lie.PL
 'I think that you are lying'
- (16) *Lipame pu ehase o Nikos ti ðulia tu*
 Be.sorry.IMP.1SG SUB lose.PST.3SG the Nikos the job.ACC CL:3-SG.GEN
 'I am sorry that Nick lost his job'
- (17) *Fovate mipos ton ðune*
 be.afraid.IMP.1SG SUB CL:3-SG.ACC see.PF.3PL
 'He is afraid they might see him'
- (18) *ðelo na kanis ta maθimata su*
 want.1SG.IMP.1SG PCL do.2SG.IMP.2SG the lesson.PL.ACC CL: 2-SG.GEN
 'I want you to study'

The CCs introduced by *oti*, *pos*, *mipos*, *pu* contain a F verb in the indicative mood, and the ones introduced with *na* contain a F verb in the subjunctive. Like Turkish, Greek has small clauses (Spyropoulos 1998) (19).

- (19) *I epitropi ekrine ton ipopsifio*
 the comission judged.3SG the candidate.ACC.SG.MASC
aneparki
 inadequate. ACC.SG.MASC
 'The commission judged the candidate inadequate'

and with motion verbs it allows serial verb constructions (Roussou 2006) (20).

- (20) *ela kaθise mazi mas*
 Come.IMP.2SG sit.IMP.2SG with CL: 1-PL.GEN
 'Come sit with us'

5. The Research

5.1. The subjects and methodology

The data used for this study were collected from 16 bilingual children (11 girls and 5 boys) all members of the GTB community. The age range of the subjects is between 9 and 18 (mean age 13.06). For the integrity of our results,⁵ the following social variables were homogenized as much as possible: (i) both the subjects and their parents were born and have been living in Rhodes; (ii) the subjects had not lived in a (Standard) Turkish speaking environment for more than six months; (iii) the parents of the subjects are small business owners or employees and have had no formal education in Turkish.

Our analysis is based on data coming from four different sources. The first and main source of information was the CCs we isolated from recordings of naturally occurring discourse produced by the children in earlier stages of our research (Georgalidou et al. forthcoming, Kaili et al. 2009, Çeltek & Kaili forthcoming). The second source of data was an indirect acceptability judgment task. The subjects were read/shown 12 groups of sentences which consisted of four different variants of the same sentence⁶ (with different word order or including F or NF verb types) and were asked to indicate if they have encountered the sentence they had just heard and if they had, they were asked to indicate how (un)common each variant in their local dialect is (in a scale from 1[uncommon] to 4 [common]). (21–22) are two examples of the twelve groups of sentences they were asked to judge.⁷

(21)		<i>Encounter</i>	<i>uncommon-common</i>
(a)	<i>Ali kitap okumayı seviyor</i>	yes/no	1 – 2 – 3 – 4
(b)	<i>Ali seviyor kitap okumayı</i>	yes/no	1 – 2 – 3 – 4
(c)	<i>Ali kitap okumak seviyor</i>	yes/no	1 – 2 – 3 – 4
(d)	<i>Ali seviyor kitap okusun</i>	yes/no	1 – 2 – 3 – 4
(22)		<i>Encounter</i>	<i>uncommon-common</i>
(a)	<i>Ahmet'in sinemaya gittiğini duyduk</i>	yes/no	1 – 2 – 3 – 4
(b)	<i>Ahmet sinemaya gitti diye duyduk</i>	yes/no	1 – 2 – 3 – 4
(c)	<i>Duyduk ki Ahmet sinemaya gitmiş</i>	yes/no	1 – 2 – 3 – 4
(d)	<i>Ahmet'in sinemaya gittiğini diye duyduk</i>	yes/no	1 – 2 – 3 – 4

Our third source of data was obtained via story telling. We asked our subjects to narrate the fairy tale *Little Red Riding Hood* in Turkish (after having confirmed that they knew the tale), in a semi-guided manner. We showed our subjects a sequence of

⁵ As indicated in Cornips and Poletto (2005: 949).

⁶ In some cases ungrammatical.

⁷ All sentences were uttered by the interviewer with a neutral intonation so that they were not perceived as marked.

pictures and asked them to tell the story. We interrupted the narration at certain points and posed questions that were expected to obtain a CC as an answer. For example, after showing the relevant picture we asked:

- (23) *Annesi Kırmızı Başlıklı Kızın elindeki sepeti ne yapmasını istiyor?*
 ‘What is Little Red Riding Hood’s mother asking her to do
 with the basket in her hands?’

Finally, we asked our subjects to translate twelve Greek sentences into Turkish. These sentences were similar (in regard to their form and meaning) to the ones of the first task. In the former three tasks, each subject was recorded separately. Recordings took place in July and August 2010. The reason for collecting data from both naturally occurring speech and constrained interviews was to get an overall idea of the subjects’ performance and competence in Turkish as far as the CCs are concerned.

5.2. Summary of the results

The results of our study show that our subjects possess a kind of ‘contact/mixed’ grammar of CCs. It seems that they have a good command of the different types of CCs in Turkish, but there is a mismatch between their competence in CCs and their actual use of them.

More specifically, our recordings of naturally occurring discourse reveal the following:⁸

Our subjects are inclined to use F-type CCs, mostly with a VO word order.

- (24) *Bil-mi-yo-m* *ne* *di-ce-m*
 know-NEG-PROGR-1SG what say.FUT-1SG
 ‘I do not know what to say’
Anne-m-ler *iste-mi-yo* *çalış-e-m*
 mother-1SG.POSS-PL want-NEG-PROGR.3SG work.SUBJ-1SG
 ‘My parents don’t want me to work’

Also, there are examples of our subjects using the VO word order even when they use a NF complement.

- (25) *İsti-yo-n* *gör-mek*
 want-PROGR-2SG see-INF
 ‘You want to see (it)’

⁸ One anonymous reviewer pointed to the need of presenting a statistical analysis of our results. The distribution of frequency of CCs in the community under study will be the subject matter of a forthcoming contribution.

Often, when the verb of the main clause is the motion verb *git-*, they use SVC instead of a CC.

- (26) *Git-ti yat-sın*
 go-PST.3SG lay down-IMP.3SG
 'He went to sleep'

There are cases in which even if they use the predominant NF-type OV CCs, the subject of the embedded clause has no genitive marking.

- (27) *Ahmet ne söyle-diğ-i-ni duy-ma-dı-m*
 Ahmet what say-VN-3SG.POSS-ACC hear-NEG-PST-1SG
 'I didn't hear what Ahmet said'

Despite the fact that they are very few in number, there are cases of non-co-referential sentences in which the verb of the CC is not marked for person or case and its subject has no genitive marking, as in (28a) or the cases in which the verb is marked for case but still not marked for person, as in (28b).

- (28) *Anne kız yemek götür-mek söylü-yor*
 mother daughter food take-INF say-PROGR.3SG
 (Intended meaning: the mother tells her daughter to take some food
 (to her grandmother))
Ayşe ben kitap oku-ma-yı isti-yor
 Ayşe I book read-VN-ACC want-PROGR.3SG
 (Intended meaning: Ayşe wants me to read books)

Our subjects sometimes use a F-type VO CC in cases where the meaning in Turkish is expressed with a causative verb.

- (29) *Öğretmen proje koy-uyo öğrenci-ler-e yaz-sın-lar*
 teacher project put-PROGR.3SG student-PL-DAT write-IMP-3PL
 'The teacher is getting the students to write a project'

In those cases in which the verb of the superordinate clause is *duy-*, they use a bare-sub-Final CC with a preceding *ki* and when the event described in the CC is in the past tense, they prefer *-DI* instead of the evidential *-mİş*.

- (30) *Duy-du-m ki Ahmet git-ti*
 hear-PST-1SG ki Ahmet go-PST.3SG
 'I heard that Ahmet has gone'

In the indirect acceptability judgment test they exhibited an overwhelming preference⁹ for the predominant NF-type OV CCs as the most common variant in their dialect¹⁰ as shown in Table I.

Table I. Acceptability judgments test results

Sentences	Preference percentages
Bu filmi görmek istiyorum	79.5%
Ne diyeceğimi bilmiyorum	71.75%
Ahmet yatmaya gitti	92%
Herkes senin gittiğini sanıyor	73.25%
Ahmet'in sinemaya gittiğini duyduk	65.5%
Ayşe benim kitap okumamı istiyor	81.25%
Ahmet'in ne söylediğini duymadım	78%
Ali kapıyı kapatmayı unuttu	89%
Ali kitap okumayı seviyor	93.75%
Ayşe'nin gittiğini duydum	76.5%

There were only two cases where something different from a NF-type OV CC was preferred (31).

- (31) 'Çocuk düşecek sandı' (64%) surpasses the NF version
'Çocuk düşeceğini sandı' (59.25%)

and

- (32) 'Bana yemeği beğenmedin gibi geliyor' (60.75%) surpasses the NF
'Yemeği beğenmediğini düşünüyorum' (51.5%).

Moreover, in those cases in which a group of sentences included a variant which was neither grammatical nor seemed Greek-like, all our subjects marked it as a sentence they had never encountered. For example in (33) the fourth version received negative answers from all our informants (16/16).

- (33) Encounter uncommon-common
(a) Ahmet yatmaya gitti yes/no 1 – 2 – 3 – 4

⁹ The term *preference* used in the present paper refers to our subjects' intuitive choice of the most common variant in their local dialect.

¹⁰ For the possible reasons of this mismatch see discussion below.

(b) <i>Ahmet gitti yatsın</i>	yes/no	1 – 2 – 3 – 4
(c) <i>Ahmet gitti yatmaya</i>	yes/no	1 – 2 – 3 – 4
(d) <i>Ahmet yatsın gitti</i>	yes/no	1 – 2 – 3 – 4

In the narration of the fairy tale our subjects again exhibited an overwhelming preference for the predominant NF-type OV CCs in the first parts of their speech (when they paid maximum attention to monitoring their performance) but also produced many F-type VO CCs by the end of story (when they got used to the process and paid minimum attention to monitoring their speech). Also, they produced sentences with a CC in infinitival form where a verbal noun plus a case marker was required (34):

- (34) *'Kurt ne yap-ma-yı düşün-üyor?'*
 wolf what do-VN-ACC think-PROGR.3SG
 'What is the wolf planning to do?'
'Büyükanne-nin kılığ-ı-na gir-mek ve
 grandma-GEN vesture-3SG.POSS-DAT enter-INF and
Kokinoskufitsa ¹¹ *'yı yi-mek'*
 Red Riding Hood-ACC eat-INF
 'to dress up like the grandmother and eat Little Red Riding Hood'

Similarly, in the translation of Greek to Turkish task our subjects mostly preferred the NF-type OV CCs. However, in two cases they were in favor of a VO CC introduced by *ki* and followed by a F verb type (84,37%), despite the fact that this was their less preferred version in the judgment task (32,75%) (35).

- (35) *Duy-du-k ki Ahmet sinema-ya git-ti/git-miş*
 hear-PST-1PL ki Ahmet cinema-DAT go-PST/EV.3SG
 'We heard that Ahmet went to the cinema'

6. Discussion, conclusions, extensions

Our goal in this paper was to explore the use of CCs in the GTB children on Rhodes and to discover whether the profound use of VO F-type CCs is due to copying from Greek (in regard to the intense contact) and/or incomplete acquisition. Naturalistic data gave us evidence for the assumption of the use of VO F-type CCs. This finding is in complete agreement with the situations discussed in Johanson 2002a. The extensive use of VO order together with right-branching complement constructions and finite elements irrespective of pragmatic functions can be explained via the in-

11 The name of *Little Red Riding Hood* in Greek.

fluence of prolonged contact with Greek. Still, there is need for both quantitative and qualitative analysis of more extensive data.

However, the data derived from the judgment task, the narration of the fairy tale and the translation of sentences from Greek to Turkish in the context of constrained interviews revealed a mismatch between the judgments of the GTB children about the CC constructions and their actual use of them. The data have also shown that the GTB children have implicit knowledge of the predominant OV NF CCs of Turkish. This fact brings to the forefront two important factors. On the one hand, it highlights the well-known unreliability of speakers' judgments as well as their exhibited preference for well-established linguistic variables¹² (cf. Labov 1972, 1996). On the other hand, while RT usage may be restricted to specific social domains, i.e. in the home as well as at social gatherings of the community such as religious celebrations and various social events (marriages, etc.), it is also true that periodic traveling to Turkey and watching Turkish TV channels via satellite facilitate contact with Standard Turkish and thus improve the competence of the speakers in Turkish.

Therefore, we need to juxtapose judgment with actual use in further research that would control the sociolinguistic factors that affect the use of CCs in RT, irrespective of how extended this use is.

Acknowledgements

Our special thanks goes to the audience of the 15th International Conference on Turkish Linguistics and two anonymous reviewers for their constructive comments on the first drafts of this article. We would also like to thank all the children that participated in our research as informants, as well as their parents for their consent. Any shortcomings or mistakes are our responsibility.

References

- Boeschoten, Hendrik & Johanson, Lars (eds.) 2006. *Turkic languages in contact*. (Turcologica 61.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Cornips, Leonie & Poletto, Cecilia 2005. On standardizing syntactic elicitation techniques. *Lingua* 115, 939–957.
- Çeltek, Aytaç & Kaili, Hasan (forthcoming). The influence of Greek on the Turkish variety of the bilingual in Greek and Turkish community of Rhodes. In: Rehbein, Jochen & Sağın-Şimşek, Çiğdem (eds.), *Handbook on Turkish in contact*. Münster: Waxmann.
- Demir, Nurettin & Johanson, Lars 2006. Dialect contact in Northern Cyprus. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 181, 1–10.
- Dixon, Robert M. W. 2006. Complement clauses and complementation strategies in typological perspective. In: Dixon, Robert M.W. & Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. (eds.) *Complementation: A cross-linguistic typology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1–48.

12 The children participating in the project knew that the researchers who conducted the tests (Aytaç and Hasan) were both academic staff and teachers of Turkish.

- Doğruöz, A. Seza & Backus, Ad 2009. Innovative constructions in Dutch Turkish: An assessment of ongoing contact-induced change. *Bilingualism: Language and cognition* 12 (1), 41–63.
- Gardner-Chloros, Penelope 2008. Bilingual data: Criteria for its classification. In: Li Wei & Moyer, Melissa (eds.) *The Blackwell guide to research methods in bilingualism*. Oxford: Blackwell. 53–73.
- Georgalidou, Marianthi & Kaili, Hasan & Çeltek, Aytaç 2010. Code-alternation patterns in bilingual conversation: A conversation analysis approach. *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 10 (2), 317–344.
- Georgalidou, Marianthi & Spyropoulos, Vassilis & Kaili, Hasan 2011. Spoken varieties of Greek in the bilingual Muslim community of Rhodes. In: Galani, Alexandra & Tsoulas, George (eds.) *Proceedings of the 7th International Conference on Greek Linguistics*. [online]. Available at: <http://83.212.19.218/icgl7/Georgalidou-et-al.pdf> [23-06-2012].
- Georgalidou, Marianthi & Spyropoulos, Vassilis & Kaili, Hasan & Revithiadou, Anthi & Çeltek, Aytaç (forthcoming). Spoken varieties of Greek and Turkish in the Muslim bilingual community of Rhodes. In: Karagiannidou, Evangelia & Papadopoulou, Charis O. & Skourtou, Eleni (eds.) *Language diversity and language learning: New Paths to Literacy. Proceedings of the 42nd Linguistics Colloquium in Rhodes 2007*, Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Göksel, Aslı & Kerslake, Celia 2005. *Turkish: A comprehensive grammar*. London: Routledge.
- Heine, Bernd & Kuteva, Tania 2005. *Language contact and grammatical change*. Cambridge University Press.
- Holton, David & Mackridge, Peter & Philippaki-Warbuton, Irene 1997. *Greek: A comprehensive grammar of the modern language*. London: Routledge.
- Johanson, Lars 2000. Attractiveness and relatedness: Notes on Turkic language contacts. In: Good, Jeff & Yu, Alan C. L. (eds.) *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistic Society, February 12-15, 1999. Special session on Caucasian, Dravidian, and Turkic linguistics*. Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistics Society. 87–94.
- Johanson, Lars 2002a. *Structural factors in Turkic language contacts*. London: Curzon.
- Johanson, Lars 2002b. Do languages die of ‘structuritis’? On the role of code-copying in language endangerment. *Rivista di Linguistica*, 14.2, 249–270.
- Johanson, Lars 2006. Turkic language contacts in a typology of code interaction. In: Boeschoten & Johanson (eds.) 2006. 4–26.
- Kaili, Hasan & Spyropoulos, Vassilis & Georgalidou, Marianthi & Çeltek, Aytaç 2009. Causative constructions in the Turkish variety of the bilingual Muslim community of Rhodes: A preliminary study. In: Ay, Sıla & Aydın, Özgür & Ergenç, İclal & Gökmen, Seda & İşsever, Selçuk & Peçenek, Dilek (eds.) *Essays on Turkish linguistics: Proceedings of the 14th International Conference on Turkish Linguistics*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz-Verlag. 403–412.
- Kerslake, Celia 2007. Alternative subordination strategies in Turkish. In: Rehbein, Jochen & Hohenstein, Christiane & Pietsch, Lukas (eds.) *Connectivity in grammar and discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 231–258.
- Kidd, Evan & Lieven, Eelena & Tomasello, Michael 2005. The acquisition of complement clause constructions: A sentence repetition study. In: Clark, Eve V. (ed.) *Constructions and acquisition: Proceedings of the 2004 Stanford Child Language Research Forum*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications. 50–59.

