

DİLLERİ VE KÜLTÜRLERİ  
YOK OLMA TEHLİKESİNE MARUZ  
TÜRK TOPLULUKLARI



HACETTEPE ÜNİVERSİTESİ  
TÜRKİYAT ARAŞTıRMALARI  
ENSTİTÜSÜ

İUMMEЖДУНАРОДНЫЙ НАУЧНЫЙ  
ТОРКОЛОГИЧЕСКИЙ СИМПОЗИУМ  
языки и культура исчезающих тюркских народов  
THE 4TH INTERNATIONAL  
TURKISH STUDIES SYMPOSIUM  
ENDANGERED TURKIC LANGUAGES AND CULTURES  
4. ULUSLARARASI TÜRKİYAT  
ARAŞTıRMALARI SEMPOZYUMU

DİLLER VE KÜLTÜRLERİ YOK OLMA TEHLİKESİNE MARUZ TÜRK TOPLULUKLARI  
23-26 MAYIS 2012  
ANKARA



DİLLERİ VE KÜLTÜRLERİ YOK OLMA TEHLİKESİNE MARUZ TÜRK TOPLULUKLARI  
4. ULUSLARARASI TÜRKİYAT ARAŞTıRMALARI SEMPOZYUMU BİLDİRİLERİ

# 4. ULUSLARARASI TÜRKİYAT ARAŞTıRMALARI SEMPOZYUMU BİLDİRİLERİ

EDİTÖRLER  
MARCEL ERDAL  
YUNUS KOÇ  
MIKAİL CENGİZ

T.C.  
BAŞBANLIK  
TANITMA FONU

T.C.  
BAŞBANLIK  
YURTDAŞI TÜRKLER

TİKA

TRT

TÜBITAK

TÜRKSOY  
Uluslararası Türk Kültürü ve  
Eğitim Vakfı

Birleşmiş Milletler  
Eğitim, Bilim ve Kültür Kurumu  
Türkiye Milli Komisyonu

Yunus Emre Enstitüsü

HACETTEPE ÜNİVERSİTESİ  
TÜRKİYAT ARAŞTIRMALARI ENSTİTÜSÜ YAYINLARI

**DİLLERİ VE KÜLTÜRLERİ YOK OLMA TEHLİKESİNE MARUZ  
TÜRK TOPLULUKLARI**

**4. ULUSLARARASI TÜRKİYAT ARAŞTIRMALARI  
SEMPOZYUMU BİLDİRİLERİ**

EDİTÖRLER

MARCEL ERDAL  
YUNUS KOÇ  
MİKAİL CENGİZ

ANKARA / 2013

# **CODE-SWITCHING IN CRIMEAN TATAR**

**Oksana TYSHCHENKO-MONASTYRSKA**

## **Introduction**

Code-switching and code-copying as consequences of relations between Turkic languages and surrounding languages are quite well studied mostly on the data of Turkish, Karaim, and Tatar (see Turkish-German code-copying in Lars Johanson 1993, Turkish-Dutch code-switching in Ad Backus 1993, 2010, English-Turkish code-switching in John Eldridge 1996, Irano-Turkic code-copying in Lars Johanson 1998, Tatar-Russian code-switching and code-copying in Suzanne Wertheim 2003, contact-induced changes in Karaim in Éva Csató 2002 and other). In my study I am trying to study the mechanism of structural borrowing in language contact situations that have Crimean Tatar-Russian bilingual speech, namely code-switching, with morphemes and/or lexical structure from both of the languages in contact. My study was conducted in Crimean Tatar speaking villages. When looking at cultural life, it is seen that the mother tongue is still widely used within the family. This change leads to code-switching phenomena that lead to language shift or maintenance in this bilingual or multilingual environment. Code-switching is frequently observed in their communicative environment as a result of language contact.

Applying the theory of code-switching and code-mixing to the languages of Ukraine we should note an interesting fact that Ukrainian-Russian bilingualism is a widespread condition of language ecology in many regions of this country (and the Crimean peninsula is among them). So the Crimean Tatar community is embedded in a situation which is already bilingual. In the fight of the official language (Ukrainian) with the dominant language (Russian)<sup>1</sup> the minority Crimean Tatar language plays the role of an identity marker in the Crimean multilingual space, occupying its own segment in the linguistic and ethnic environment of the region. The situation is complicated also by the fact that Crimean Tatars are mostly bilingual, and Russian and Ukrainian do not represent a communicative barrier for them, whereas Slavic population of the peninsula neither speaks nor understands Crimean Tatar. There is distinct difference between self-perception of Crimean Tatars and the way the surrounding ethnicities see them. Thus, Slavic population views them similarly as Europeans view Moslem immigrants, whereas Crimean Tatars perceive themselves as the indigenous population of the peninsula (Bogomolov et al. 2005: 130).

## **Methodology**

The aim of this paper is to describe code switching (CS) between Crimean Tatar and Russian based on the speech samples gathered from suburban and village bilingual settings and analyse them using Myers-Scotton's Model (1993 and later publications). Myers-Scotton's model consists of two aspects: the structurally-based

---

<sup>1</sup>More closely on Ukrainian-Russian bilingualism in Ukraine see Bilanyuk 2005, Pavlenko 2009, Taranenko 2007, Trub 2000.

Matrix Language Frame (MLF) Model and socially-based considerations (The Markedness Theory) in inter and intrasentential CS.

## Data

Data for the study were collected from the villages and the cities where bilingual Crimean Tatars resided. All interviewees were native speakers of Crimean Tatar in the Crimean region and in the cities. Additionally, 3 hours of tape-recorded natural conversations were gathered during informal visits and wedding ceremonies. I also used video-taped conversations from the news broadcast of the ATR TV-channel (the Crimean Tatar media resource).

## Discourse markers

Although some linguists use the terms ‘code-mixing’ and ‘code-switching’ interchangeably, I am following the distinction laid out by Olshtain and Blum-Kulka (1989: 60): Code-switching is “when the speaker alternates units from different codes that are higher-level constituents, at least grammatical clauses or sentences,” while code-mixing “refers to smaller units, usually words or idiomatic expressions, which are borrowed from one language and inserted into the sentence of another language”. In Crimean Tatar spontaneous speech these are both represented.

Russian discourse markers and conjunctions are highly copied formants in Turkic (Johanson 1997: 115). The unconsciously code-mixed Russian words found in the speech and writing of the Crimean Tatars described here belong to a variety of grammatical classes – including particles, adverbs, conjunctions, and question words – but can be grouped into the single functional class of discourse-pragmatic words. The Russian words code-mixed in the preferred speech of Crimean Tatars include, but are not limited to, discourse markers. They can, however, all be interpreted as belonging to the set of what Fraser (1996, *inter alia*) calls ‘pragmatic markers,’ where discourse markers are just one subset of pragmatic markers.

Brinton (1996: 33-35) puts forth a different list of features, where discourse markers are:

- often in sentence-initial position
- outside of or loosely attached to syntactic structure
- optional in the sentence
- grammatically heterogeneous (including interjections, adverbs, particles, function words, verbs, conjunctions, phrases, idioms, and clauses)
- often phonologically reduced, forming a separate tone group
- (almost) without propositional meaning
- features of oral rather than written discourse
- able to appear with high frequency.

Using all of these characteristic features as diagnostic criteria, the following items of the code-mixed Russian words found in Crimean-Tatar-preferred speech would be interpreted as prototypical discourse markers: *а*, *но*, *ну*, *даже*, *разве*, *по-моему*, *вообщe*, *потому что*, *чтобы*, *вот*, *вот так*.

## Discourse-pragmatic words

However, the set of Russian discourse-pragmatic words code-mixed in Crimean-Tatar-preferred style is significantly larger; they are not all discourse markers *per se*, even though they all linguistically encode pragmatic functionality.

- Topic change markers (e.g., English in fact, now; in my data, Russian *слушай* ‘listen!’)
- Contrastive markers (e.g., English but, nevertheless; in my data, Russian *но* ‘however’)
- Elaboration markers (e.g., English above all; in my data, Russian *мо ecmъ* ‘that is’)
- Inferential markers (e.g., English after all, as a result; in my data, Russian *мак чмо* ‘so’)

### Coordinative discourse markers *a* 'and', *but*', *u* 'and', *но* 'but', *hy* 'well', *mo...mo* 'wether... or':

- (1) *L<sub>1</sub>Kettik, L<sub>2</sub>u L<sub>1</sub>yolda eki kere cenaze bar edi.*  
Walk off-Past.1.Pl. and way-Loc. two time funeral have-Past.3.Sing
- (2) *L<sub>1</sub>On seneden ziyade L<sub>2</sub>mo L<sub>1</sub>Zelenogorskoye bar edik, L<sub>2</sub>mo*  
Ten year-Abl. more wether Zelenogorskoye go-Past.1.Pl., or  
*L<sub>1</sub>Üçközüñ cami bar edik.*  
Üçköz-Gen mosque go-Past.1.Pl.

All code-mixed Russian coordinators are used as markers of narrative structure, and coordinate “idea units” (Schiffrin, 1987) rather than acting as logical operators coordinating items in a list. And, the English discourse marker equivalent to Russian *u*, “coordinates idea units and ...continues a speaker’s action” (*ibid.* 125), which is just how Russian *i* is used when codemixed in Tatar.

### Evaluative discourse words *даже* 'even', *разве* 'isn't it', *но-моему* 'in my opinion', *просто* 'simple', *конечно* 'of course'.

- (3) *L<sub>1</sub>Ne dip aytayım size, yüregim sindy*  
What say-2ndGer. say-Imper.1.Sing. you-Dat., heart-Poss now  
*cöştü L<sub>2</sub>npocmo.*  
glad-Past.3.Sing just.

In this sentence the adverb *npocmo* ‘simply, just’ is used as a “minimizing” hedge in Russian, one that shows that the proposition does not contain “any kind of additional augmentation imposed on it by the situation or context” (Baranov et al., 1993: 171).

### Evaluation of time and degree *уже* 'already':

- (4) *L<sub>1</sub>Noyabr ayında L<sub>2</sub>yżce L<sub>1</sub>qar yawğan edi.*  
November month-PossLoc already snow fall-Plusquam.
- (5) *L<sub>1</sub>Qismet olsa L<sub>2</sub>fundament-L<sub>1</sub>nı L<sub>2</sub>yżce L<sub>1</sub>bitirdiq bu yıl, L<sub>2</sub>gəm.*  
Fate be-Cond foundation-Acc already finish-PastPl this year, well.

**Subordinating discourse marker *что*:**

(6)	<i>L<sub>1</sub>Haber</i>	<i>keldi,</i>	<i>L<sub>2</sub>что</i>	<i>L<sub>1</sub>neme</i>	<i>L<sub>2</sub>sud</i>	<i>L<sub>1</sub>olacaq.</i>
	New	come-Past,	that	it seems	court	be-Fut.

Crimean Tatar using a code-mixed *что* ‘that’ is almost identical syntactically to Russian – the Crimean Tatar element is essentially a calque of the Russian with a subordinate clause that comes after the main clause and is introduced by a subordinating conjunction. Other Russian subordinating discourse markers used in Crimean Tatar conversation *потому что* “because”, *чтобы* “for”, *вот* “here”, *вот мак* ‘that is’.

**Metacommentary words**

The Russian words code-mixed to produce metacommentary on text are:

- *короче* ‘in brief’ (adverb)
- *кстати* ‘by the way’ (adverb)
- *слушай(me)* ‘listen’ (verb in imperative)
- *ну в обещем* (preposition-noun phrase) etc.

(7) *L<sub>1</sub>Paramız da yetmeyecek, küşümiz da yetmeyecek. Buralar ayttılar, L<sub>2</sub>ну в обещем, L<sub>1</sub>çaremiz yoq yardım etmegenler.*

*Короче* ‘in brief,’ points out that the speaker is summarizing, and marks equative, or positive structure, such that the content preceding it must approximately conform to the content following it.

**Functions of Crimean-Tatar Russian code-switching**

In this part I would like to point out functional aspects of code-switching when larger units like clauses are being code-switched. It should be noted that manner and functions of code-switching and code-mixing differ from generation to generation. When older generation prefer to talk each other Crimean Tatar mixing the Russian discourse markers, metacommentary words, some Russian common known words with the Crimean Tatar formants (*kadrları* 'employee-PIPoss', *svidanieğə* 'meeting-Dat', *fundamentini* 'foundation-Acc', *sredstvosi* 'fund-Poss', *çisloda* 'date-Loc').etc., intermediate generation speech is generally characterized by significantly increased role for Russian. In this case code-switching is mostly intersentential. Younger generation mostly prefer to speak Russian using some Crimean Tatar words as identical markers. These are usually relationship terms (*ana* “mother”, *baba* “father”, *bita* “grandmother”, *tize* “aunt”, *dudu* “aunt” etc. and their russified diminutive forms *anışka*, *babaşka*, *bitaşka*, *tizeşka*, *duduşka*), interjections (*vay*, *valla*, *maşalla* etc.), turns of phrase (*sağ ol(uñız)* “thank you (polite form)”, *selam* “hello”, *ne yapasıñ* “how do you do”, *qismet olsa* “if someone will be lucky” etc.).

**Excerpt 1.** As first example I choose one interesting case where a Russian-preferred Crimean Tatar man shows the language he uses when speaking with his son. Russian-Crimean Tatar code-switching can be often used when the speaker is reporting what someone has said.

- (8) *L<sub>2</sub>B прошлом году мой сын пришёл, L<sub>1</sub>baba, L<sub>2</sub>говорит,*  
 In last-Loc. year-Loc. my son come-Past.3.Sing father say-Pres.3.Sing  
*L<sub>1</sub>mektepke bir adam keldi, bu kitap kösterdi.*  
 school-Dat. one man come-Past.3.Sing. this book show-Past.3.Sing.

From his comment, we can see that the man is initially referring to his son's words, first in Russian and then in Crimean Tatar. The answer in Crimean Tatar may reflect its serious nature. Here code-switching is we-code, it is informal and intimate.

#### Excerpt 2.

- (9) *L<sub>1</sub>Pek doğru olur edi ki bu bayramni L<sub>2</sub>праздник*  
 Very right be-Aor.3.Sing do-Past.3.Sing that this holiday-Acc holiday  
*c полными слёз глазами L<sub>1</sub> ep boyle aytmağa.*  
 with full-InstrPl tear-InstrPl. eye-InstrPl all such say-Inf.

The interviewee is not only answering the question but also animating the voice, as Russian words sound stricter and more official than the Crimean Tatar beginning of the sentence. The speaker's tone rises, and the entire Russian phrase is pronounced very clearly and smoothly. An explanation for code-switching is that the interviewee repeats the words of a well known for a Russian speaking person quote. Another reason could be the wish for expressivity.

**Excerpt 3.** As for the language choice patterns found, the speaker sticks to his individually preferred language in the specific setting. Only when the degree of topic involvement (job) rises in the conversation is Crimean Tatar-Russian code-switching used to differentiate the topics of the talk.

- (10) *L<sub>1</sub>Eki kere L<sub>2</sub>свидание L<sub>1</sub>berdiler bizge. Anamnen beraber*  
 Two time meeting give-PastPl we-Dat. Mother-PossInstr together  
*L<sub>2</sub>свидание-L<sub>1</sub>ğa bardıq.*  
 meeting-Dat go-Past1Pl.
- (11) *L<sub>1</sub>Men şindi ayrıca L<sub>2</sub>тренировка L<sub>1</sub>yapam. On yedincisi L<sub>2</sub>число-L<sub>1</sub>da*  
 I now separate training do-Pres1Sing. Twelve date-Loc.  
*L<sub>2</sub>собор olacaq.*  
 collection be-Fut.3.Sing.

Here Russian seems to be associated with official situations and Crimean Tatar is more intimate and close.

**Excerpt 4.** Languages of emotions, emotions and code-switching:

- (12) *L<sub>1</sub>Laf etme, L<sub>2</sub>кому говорят!*  
 Talk do-Neg.Imper.2, who-Dat. say-Pres.3.Pl.

The student is animating the teacher's voice. An explanation for code-switching is that the student repeats the words of the instructor and wants to be more authoritative. Another reason could be expressivity: he was nervous that the co-student had not listened properly and was asking to repeat.

## Conclusion

Word, phrase, and sentence code-switching are very common in the speech of Crimean Tatars. This kind of code-switch helps to bridge a gap in the discourse and plays a role of compensatory strategy. Switching native (Crimean Tatar) and dominating (Russian) codes in their bilingual speech Crimean Tatars choose the language they feel most comfortable with and have greater competence in. In the informal situations Russian as L2 can fulfill a wide range of functions from changing topic, facilitating conversation to showing expressivity.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alagözlü, N. K. (2002). *Code-Switching Patterns and Underlying Socio-psychological Configurations in a Kabardian Speech Community: The Probable Effects of Urbanization*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation Ankara: Hacettepe University Institute of Social Sciences.
- Backus, A. (2010). The role of codeswitching, loan translation and interference in the emergence of an immigrant variety of Turkish. *Working Papers in Corpus-based Linguistics and Language Education* 5, 225-241 [http://cblle.tufs.ac.jp/assets/files/publications/working\\_papers\\_05/section/225-241.pdf](http://cblle.tufs.ac.jp/assets/files/publications/working_papers_05/section/225-241.pdf).
- Backus, A. (1993). Turkish-Dutch code-switching and the Frame-Process Model In: Guus Extra & Ludo Verhoeven (eds.) *Immigrant languages in Europe*. Clevedon & Philadelphia & Adelaide.
- Bilaniuk, L. (2005). *Contested tongues: Language politics and cultural correction in Ukraine*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.
- Baranov, A. N., Plungyan, V. A., Rahilina, E. V. (1993). *Putevoditel' po diskursivnum slovam russkogo yazika*. Moskva: Pomovskiy i partneri.
- Bogomolov, O., Danilov, S., Semivolos, I., Yavors'ka, G. (2005). *Islams'ka identičnist' v Ukraini*. Kiev: AMES.
- Csató, É. (2002). Karaim: A high-copying language. In: Mari C. Jones & Edith Esch (eds.) *Language change. The interplay of internal, external and extra-linguistic factors*. [= Contributions to the sociology of language 86]. New York & Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 315-327.
- Eldridge, J. (1996). Code-switching in a Turkish secondary school. *ELT journal Volume 50/4*. Oxford Univ Press. 303-311.
- Emirova, A. (2008). Yazykovaia kompetentsiya krymskikh tatar (The linguistic competence of Crimean Tatars). In A. Emirova. *Izbrannye nauchnyie raboty*, 196-199. Simferopol: Krymchpedgiz.
- Fraser, B. (1996). Pragmatic markers. *Pragmatics*, 6(2): 167-190.
- Grenoble, L. (1998). *Deixis and information packaging in Russian discourse*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Johanson, L. (1993). Code-copying in immigrant Turkish. In: Guus Extra & Ludo Verhoeven (eds.) *Immigrant languages in Europe*. Clevedon &

Philadelphia & Adelaide. 197-221.

- Johanson, L. (1997). Kopien russischer Konjunktionen in türkischen Sprachen. In: Huber, Dieter & Worbs, Erika (eds.) *Ars transferendi. Sprache, Übersetzung, Interkulturalität*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang. 115-121.
- Johanson, L. (1998). Code-copying in Irano-Turkic. *Language Sciences* 20: 325-337.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1993). *Dueling languages: Grammatical structure in code-switching*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Myers-Scotton, C., Janice, L. J. (2000). Testing the 4-M Model: Introduction. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 4(1): 1-8.
- Olshtain, Elite and Shoshana Blum-Kulka (1989). Happy Hebrish: Mixing and Switching in American-Israeli Family Interactions. In: Susan Gass et al. (eds.), *Variation in Second Language Acquisition*. Clevedon/Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters Ltd. 59-83.
- Pavlenko, A. (2009). Language conflict in post-Soviet linguistic landscapes. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics*, 17 (1-2): 247-274.
- Schiffrin, D. (1987). *Discourse markers*. Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Taranenko, O. (2007). Ukrainian and Russian in contact: Attraction and estrangement. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 183: 119-140.
- Trub V. M. (2000). Yavişə ‘surjiku’ yak forma prostoriççya v situatsii dvomovnosti. *Movoznavstvo* 1: 46-58.
- Wertheim, S. (2003). *Linguistic purism, language shift, and contact-induced change in Tatar*. University of California, Berkeley dissertation.
- Zabrodskaja, A. (2007). Russian-Estonian Code-Switching in the University. *Arizona Working Papers in SLA & Teaching*, 14: 123-139.