Bilingual Speech in a Dutch Migration Context

Mustafa Güleç
Ankara University, DTCF
mustafagulec@hotmail.com

Abstract
This study focuses on codeswitching as a language contact phenomenon in Turkish-Dutch migration settings. Firstly a conceptual analysis is made concerning the overall valid term bilingualism. Then codeswitching is discussed on the basis of some output examples from the field. A brief critical account of three approaches (i.e. lexical borrowing of Poplack, Matrix and embedded language framework of Myers-Scotton and code copying of Johanson) regarding codeswitching has been presented and discussed in the background of some assertions of Backus concerning insertion, alternation, borrowing, conventionalization, entrenchment and mixed language. Consequently, a brief critical analysis of these terms, which are to some extent difficult to define, has been made against the indirect assumption with respect to the presence of a 'pure' language.
Key words: *bilingualism, codeswitching, borrowing, mixed language, matrix language, embedded language, code copying.*

1.Introduction

In this paper, I will give a brief descriptive account of codeswitching (CS) on the basis of some standpoints in the field of bilingualism, mainly in Dutch-Turkish language contact settings as a result of Turkish migration towards the Netherlands. Codeswitching is a concept within bilingualism, of which the name is already questionable, due to the fact that it has the suffix **–ism** referring to an ideology rather than to identifying of an existing phenomenon or situation. Bilingualism sounds as if it is a politically and ideologically loaded term, when we compare it with more neutral word, **bilinguality**, which is again the detection of an already existing concept or situation. When we look at the other inflection forms of bilingualism, we see that this term is not consistently produced. For instance, if the umbrella term 'bilingualism' would be used in other noun phrases such as 'children who speak two languages', this phrase should have been formulated normally as '*bilingualist children*', because this phrase is an expected derivation of the term bilingualism. Even the title of this paper should have been then as such: '*bilingualist speech...*'. A statement as 'the entire bilingual lexicon' should have been '*the entire bilingualist lexicon*'. Why do not we use the term '*bilingualist children*'? Because children, who are mostly from immigrant families, do not speak two languages as an expression of a social attitude or as a political sign etc. They speak two languages, because these two languages are the crucial communicative tools of their natural environment. These languages are the basic indication of their social identity. All this incongruence is presumably due to the fact that the natural status of the phenomenon i.e. bilinguality has thus far been too much a part of endless political debates rather than scientific ones.

The same discussion holds for the term multiculturalism as well. The terms with the ism-suffix are ideologically loaded in places where more than one language and culture come together to pursue a coexistence. This is one of the main motivations for people to learn a second language. In linguistic terms, one major reason for the study of "bilinguality", which is a term on the

unbeaten path, is how the fact that speakers are bilingual, influences the structure of the languages themselves, how these languages interact in structural terms within the brain. I think that this is the most interesting aspect of making use of two different languages.

Myers-Scotton defines similar concepts without neutral status by stating that "speaking only one language (typically the language you acquired as a first language or mother tongue, generally the language of your home) is called monolingualism and bilingualism is the term for speaking one or more languages" (Myers-Scotton, 2013, p. 2). According to her, usually the speakers' mother tongue or the first language is one of the two languages that make them bilinguals. Bilingualism is used as a cover term for multilingualism as well (speaking more than two languages). The term "plurilingualism" for speaking more than two languages is also used for multilingualism. All these codifications imply that monolingual settings are ideal and expected contexts, where only one language dominates the whole public and private domain. Myers-Scotton reports about those monolingual North Americans having a hard time comprehending what another language consists of or how people can manage two languages. A Portuguese-English bilingual student in the United States speaks as if English is the main language that she uses for communication, whilst she mentions "speaking another language" when she uses Portuguese in communication with her family members (Myers-Scotton, 2013: 3). According to Myers-Scotton, many people in the United States find bilingualism an exotic issue, because the stereotypical bilingual had either a romantic or a threadbare background or both. An average American citizen considered the bilinguals as individuals speaking more than one language because they were the child of European nobility or because they were the child of refugees. As a result of latest global migration movements, Americans started to associate bilingualism with migrant or unskilled workers or small businessmen (Myers-Scotton, 2013, -p. 4).

As speaking more than one language has a socio-economic background, being bilingual and all discussion around this concept have begun to contain an ideological status. It is an ironic case where the ancestors of these Americans have once colonized the land being an immigrant coming mainly from Europe. These colonizers had applied *ius soli*, (right of land, territory) commonly referred to as birthright citizenship, which is the right of anyone born in the territory of a state to nationality or citizenship. This was part of the English common law, in contrast to *ius sanguinis*, (right of blood) which derives from the Roman law that influenced the civil-law systems of mainland Europe. This controversial jurisdiction was used to protect the European soil from barbarians coming in from outside in order to keep Europe monoethnic and monocultural continent, whereas *ius soli* (right of land, territory) was implemented by the same European colonizers in order to make sure that descendants can easily spread and settle down in the colonized new land. Therefore, being bilingual was somehow perceived as threat to national integrity. The tension in between created an ideology in which being bilingual was an expression of multiculturality. Hence, the terms which are used in this context have got the ideological suffix *–ism* i.e. bilingualism, multiculturalism rather than bilinguality, multiculturality.

In this case again, we can see that phenomena blended with ideology (sentiments rather than facts) cause blurring in our efforts to understand the coexistence and the effects of two language systems within one brain, which is an extremely interesting topic of investigation for scientific fields such as linguistics, neurology, psychology, sociology etc. Getting two code systems together in one software programme can also help us understand much how monolingual system could work. Therefore, ideological discussions form always an impediment to scientific progress. If someone switches continuously between two languages during a normal daily conversation,

this case may show sociologically that this person is an immigrant. But more importantly it shows that there are obviously some parameters in the brain, that control and trigger some structures from both code systems to be put in use. It is a precious question to ask how this switching occurs between the two language systems precisely.

2.Methodology

This paper contains a critical overview of some prominent literature concerning phenomena such as bilingualism, codeswitching, codemixing, conventionalization, borrowing, entrenchment, insertion and alternation mainly in Dutch-Turkish language contact settings as a result of Turkish migration towards the Netherlands. A comparative analysis will be used as a method within data from the existing literature and the related output examples from informants. The literature concerned will serve as data base in order to demonstrate some theoretical dilemmas in the field.

3.Codeswitching (CS)

Codeswitching is the use of elements from one language in utte rances of another. This includes what is often called **borrowing** as well as the common term **grammatical interference**. If the related switch occurs within the boundaries of a sentence, it is an intrasentential codeswitching. If utterances in an idiolect follow one another by taking sentence boundaries into account on the basis of language type, then we have an extrasentential codeswitching or we may also call it codemixing.

Much of the work done in the field has tried to define constrains on possible switch locations. I will now focus mainly on the insertion of short fragments from the **Embedded Language (EL)**, which is mainly Dutch in this case into the **Matrix Language (ML)**, which is mainly Turkish in idiolects of Turkish immigrants in the Netherlands (**ML = Turkish; EL = Dutch**). Backus (1996) has an extensive database that covers many phenomena with regard to code switching.

The matrix language is the main language in CS utterances in a number of ways. The ML sets the morphosyntactic frame of sentences containing CS. In the most general terms, setting the frame means specifying the morpheme order and supplying the syntactically relevant morphemes in constituents consisting of morphemes from both participating languages. It also means determining when constituents within a sentence showing CS must occur entirely in the EL (Myers-Scotton, 2005, p. 3). The Matrix Language Frame (MLF) model specifically was designed to explain structural configurations found in codeswitching. The MLF model is based on two oppositions: the Matrix Language – Embedded Language opposition and the content-system morpheme opposition. The language making the larger contribution is the Matrix language and the other language which functions mainly as the source of borrowing is the Embedded Language. Larger contribution does not necessarily mean more morphemes, although this is often the case. Rather, contributing more means more abstract structure and structure of a certain type (Myers-Scotton, 2010, p. 15).

The second opposition is between content moprhemes and system morphemes, which may be also translated as free morphemes and bound morphemes. Myers-Scotton argues that content morphemes are the main elements conveying semantic and pragmatic aspects of messages and system morphemes largely demonstrate relations the content morphemes. She goes on to say that these two types of morpheme perform different functions in language in general monolingual or bilingual (Myers-Scotton, 2010, p. 15).

This determination is important in the sense that content-system morphemes distinction works both in monolingual and bilingual perspective. In monolingual mode, it is easy to understand the task distribution between the morpheme types, but in bilingual mode, system morphemes may be reluctant to contribute to codeswitching, as two structurally very different languages have to come together in switching process. Given this fact, the approach of Myers-Scotton is based on premises about the nature of the mental lexicon, in which all lemmas in the mental lexicon include three levels of abstract lexical structure. The three levels concerned contain all the grammatical information necessary for the surface realization of a lexical entry. The levels refer to lexical-conceptual structure, predicate-argument structure and morphological realization patterns. Lexical-conceptual structure is closest to the speaker's intentions. Pre-verbal intentions in the conceptualizer activate language-specific semantic/pragmatic feature bundles at the interface between the conceptualizer and the mental lexicon and these bundles are mapped onto entries in the mental lexicon (lemmas) as lexical-conceptual structure (Myers-Scotton, 2010, p. 19).

Thus, intentions can be found in the conceptualizer and language-specific semantic/pragmatic feature is in the intersection of the conceptualizer and the mental lexicon, in other words in the crossroads of the signified and the signifier. In this sense, the language production process of Myers-Scotton is similar to the speaking model of Levelt (1989). Speaker's intentions are in the field of the conceptualizer and the formulator is associated with the mental lexicon (lemma level), which contains directions to the formulator (morphosyntax, morphophonology) at functional level. That leads to the positional level which yields phonetic/surface forms.

Backus describes only the vernacular of Turkish immigrants in the Netherlands, as his data base consists of natural conversations among speakers in the migration setting. He sets himself free by stating firmly that nothing will be said about the other lects in the grammars of the informants, including their monolingual vernaculars, since they are not represented as such in his data base. His second assumption is that all morphemes (i.e. all specified units) an informant uses are conventionalized units in his or her idiolect, except if there are good reasons to assume that this is not the case, such as overly careful pronunciation etc. He also adds that to what extent patterns (i.e. schematic units) are entrenched remains an open question and he argues that speakers engaging in conversation with their peers say things their interlocutors can understand (Backus, 1996, p. 28).

First of all, one gets the impression from the abovementioned arguments that the language use in bilingual mode is quite different with regard to all other modes. However, even in a monolingual mode, one can observe many examples of borrowings, nonce borrowings and nonce formations. Borrowings are in this case entrenched units, which were transferred form another language. Nonce borrowings are not yet entrenched units and nonce formations are simply the result of speakers' creativity in a certain context, where speakers invent or make up a signifier for a newly discovered signified. Borrowing has a counterpart or a counter pole, which should make way for a new item to be borrowed, i.e. attrition. Backus admits that attrition is a hard issue to investigate, because we do not exactly know whether supposedly lost element was there in the mental lexicon of a speaker. Conventionalization is relatively easy to study as L2 elements from the EL are lately added to the same mental lexicon.

It seems that the same process occurs in both monolingual and bilingual language use with regard to borrowing and codeswitching. Borrowing covers mainly monolingual mode, whilst codeswitching refers only to the bilingual mode of language use. However, yet again, it is rather

difficult to draw a clear line between borrowing and codeswitching, as it seems to be a form of the borrowing. In so far as this issue is concerned, Backus concentrates only on bilingual contact, because this is descriptively easier case, since the etymology of a given element can usually be established beyond doubt. This is not necessarily true in the case of patterns in monolingual use (Backus, 1996, p. 29). Backus claims that Turkish did not have the word *friet* (French fries) before immigration, but Dutch did, so *friet* came from the EL in bilingual use. He adds that the syntactic flexibility of Turkish impedes the assumption of any effect of the EL on the ML (i.e. Dutch on Turkish).

These are claims as such that it is hard for us to have a sound discussion, which can be drawn anywhere. Because, for example, there is a concept for *friet* in Turkish (i.e. *patates k□zartmas □*), but the very context in which the Dutch word *friet* is used is different from the equivalent Turkish word. In Turkey, French fries are in general made at home and eaten at home, usually not on the street, which is like buying and eating ice cream while walking on the street. Thus, *friet* can be bought and eaten on street in the Netherlands, while one can eat *patates k□zartmas □* mainly in indoor settings. Probably the language for the relevant borrowing or codeswitching occurs in Turkish-Dutch bilingual discourse. Because the setting, context or environment is crucial for the perception of speakers. I had eaten *patates k□zartmas □*on street with my relatives who came to visit me in the Netherlands. While speaking Turkish with each other, we always used the word *patates k□zartmas □* for *friet* we ate on street. However, whenever I introduced them *friet* as an apart, local concept with its special name *friet*, then they started to use, from then on, this particular word as well. Thus, the claim of Backus regarding Turkish lacking the word *friet* (French fries) before immigration falls by presenting us an eye opener, which implicates that conventionalization does not occur as a result of attrition or lack of a concept in the mental lexicon concerned. Sometimes similar concepts can be used parallel to one another and the setting can make the only difference with regard to their semantic structure.

For Backus, the absence of independent criteria for establishing when something has been conventionalized as an element of the language, makes the debate on borrowings and CS an endless rivalry. So his position will be that words used by a speaker are conventionalized units in the vernacular lect of his idiolect and the degree to which it is entrenched is open to debate (Backus, 1996: 31). Speaker will use an element in his/her utterance, but whether this particular utterance takes already a place in the mental lexicon is open to discussion. If it is not in the mental lexicon, then how can a speaker make use of that element? This issue sets the conscious language use of any speaker on doubt, as if language users need a continuous assistance in this enterprise. If we take this issue in monolingual terms into account, it becomes clear that conventionalization and entrenchment are all foggy issues, which are open to change any minute.

In an analysis by Zachary B. Wolf on CNN on the 5ht of May, 2020, the Dutch-born anthropologist Harald Prins reports that the Dutch are inventing new words to describe the impact of the coronavirus[1]. Prins adds that it appears, not surprisingly, that Covid-19 related neologisms are rampant in the Netherlands and probably in most, if not all other, languages, too. Prins expects that the most of the newly invented Dutch words will survive, but some will disappear, albeit with unsuspected accretions. In Dutch, for example, many people do not know that a popular/slang word like *klerevent* (difficult to translate, but equivalent to bastard or rotten fellow) derives from cholera (*klere*). Here are some Dutch corona neologisms with the free

[1] https://edition.cnn.com/2020/05/05/politics/what-matters-may-4

translation of Harald Prins (we should bear in mind that several terms resonate and have their true meaning in a unique social-cultural Dutch context):

***Huidhonger* / skin hunger:** a longing for human contact while in isolation.

***Anderhalvemetereconomie* / six-feet-economy:** an economy constructed to avoid spreading coronavirus.

***Hoestschaamte* / cough-shame:** the anxiety one may experience about possibly triggering a panic among the people nearby when making a coughing sound for whatever reason

***Coronahufter* / coronajerk:** shopper at a supermarket or store who violates the six-foot social distance prescription or other safe-keeping protocol.

***Druppelcontact* / spray-contact:** exchange of little droplets when sneezing or coughing, esp. as source of infection.

***Onthamsteren* / dehoarding:** processing long-stored shelf-stable food into a meal.

***Straatschaamte* / street-shame:** the embarrassment someone experiences when being out for urgently necessary errands during lockdown.

***Toogviroloog* / blather-virologist:** dilettante who spreads false or unsubstantiated information about the virus, its transmission, or its treatment.

Harald Prins reports also that a new Dutch corona lexicon was created and is updated. It already comprises 700 new words, including those noted above (cf.)[2]. As can be seen in the examples given by Prins above that conventionalization and entrenchment are all indeed unstable and unsteady concepts in practical terms within linguistics. In fact, Prins admits also that some new words will persist and some others will vanish for good from the sociolect. All these arguments and examples mentioned by Prins above put the extensive discussion of Backus into a better perspective. For us readers at least, they set a clear and sound platform to be able to relativize and criticize the general assumptions of Backus.

According to Backus, conventionalization of elements from the contact language leads to what we have always referred to as borrowings (though of course not necessarily borrowed words). He asserts that in bilingual contact settings resistance to interlingual innovations might be somewhat higher than in the case of intralingual innovations in monolingual contact. Because the forms from another language are more different and may therefore be more salient (Backus, 1996, p. 31). First of all, his distinction between bilingual and monolingual contact is not very clear. "Monolingual contact" seems to yield an oxymoron in this analysis, because contact is the condition of meeting, touching or coming together of two different beings, objects or phenomena. In this sense, two languages are expected to come together or to get in touch with one another. However, there must be only one language in a monolingual contact. Thus, in this case, his terms "intralingual innovations in monolingual contact" can refer either to new elements in a language as a result of a cultural contact with the language of another country or to new terms and elements arising from internal dynamics and interactions of any language on the basis of its own creative system.

An example for the last case can be given from Turkish. Towards the end of the last century, 'computer' had been designed and put in use. As it was a new concept, a new signifier should have been found for this concept in Turkish. At first phase, Turks had borrowed its name from English, when they had to buy its object. So, in the 80s, the Turkish word for 'computer' was *kompütür*. Then, occasionally *kompüter* was used as a result of any necessary phonological

[2] https://www.taalbank.nl/2020/03/14/coronawoordenboek

transformation or assimilation. Today in Turkey nobody uses these words for a computer. Instead, an internal creation and production *bilgisayar* (a compound consisting of *bilgi* 'information' and *sayar* 'something that counts' meaning 'something that counts information') was suggested by a Turkish engineer and totally welcomed by the Turkish speech community. Even this single example can convince us that the argument of Backus regarding "conventionalization of elements from the contact language leading to entrenchment and borrowings" is falsifiable. In fact, Backus needs to discuss the terms such as 'conventionalization', 'borrowing' and 'entrenchment' more in detail, so that these concepts can be specified in structural sense. He uses rather general conceptual ramifications with regard to these crucial concepts: "…My simplifying assumption here is that accessing a word for the first time means instant conventionalization. Recall however, that conventionalization is a process: it covers a continuum of entrenchment levels. The idea of instant conventionalization does not imply that a word used for the first time is as entrenched as one which has been used every day for years by that speaker…" (Backus, 1996: 32). Still this gives us no steady ground on which we can theoretically operate by using the terms 'conventionalization', 'borrowing' and 'entrenchment'.

The above mentioned example concerning computer was a Turkish word, which was totally entrenched (according to the classification of Backus) in the mental lexicon of the Turkish speech community in the 1980s. However, as of 1990s it was treated as a weird element in the lexicon and liquidated finally. In language issues, cause and reaction may change drastically due to any unknown or unforeseen reason. Even if it is a migration setting, yet again everything must be governed by all time present parameters, which can be observed universally. The criteria that can be set for 'conventionalization', 'borrowing' and 'entrenchment' should take into account the setting, the very context in which new elements will be put in use as part of the mental lexicon. The conditions and the need for a linguistic sign are preliminary determiners for a permanent settlement of that sign into the mental lexicon. If the social conditions regarding this pandemic period change all over the world, then the new Dutch inventions such as *skin hunger, six-feet-economy* and *blather-virologist* can disappear from the mental lexicon of the Dutch speech community. The new words as *cough-shame* and *spray-contact* may, however, remain in the Dutch sociolect as a result of the general fear and trauma caused by this globally spread disease. Thus, some new words remain on the basis of the need for the concept and some disappear, which is an inevitable outcome for surviving of linguistic signs.

Backus argues that when intrasentential CS is conventionalized, we are not talking about CS anymore; the term "code-switching", no matter how far we have stretched it, still means something like "alternating languages". He states that if an originally L2 word has been conventionalized and is considered an L1 word, the L1 speaker using it in L1 is not switching languages anymore. He is instead using his native language, which is to some extent a mixed language (Backus, 1996, p. 35).

Backus seems to have faith in the existence of languages, which are "pure" and not mixed at all. If a borrowing is internalized into the mental lexicon and becomes a part of the L1, then 'we can never speak' of a mixed language. Then, we can go ahead and say maybe that there is no language contact at all. If we ever listen to any Dutch radio or tv-programme, it definitely will not be a surprise for us to hear a Dutch speaker so now and then using English phrases or words like *anything goes, whatever, amazing, the way out* etc. scattered around his/her Dutch discourse. We are sure that this kind of CS did not occur in an immigrant setting or whatsoever. If we go a

bit further and say that at least fourty percent of English consists of Latin words, including the verb of this relative clause i.e. “consist”, although English is originally a Germanic language, we can clearly realize that all languages are permanently subject to mutually influencing, interacting and mixing. Language contact in a migration setting is only one example of many cases leading to mixing phenomena. Yet, it seems as if Backus departs from ‘a hypothetical, imaginative immaculate language’, ‘a pure language’, which got never in contact with another language or culture. We all know that this is a tremendously theoretical and utopic case. People trade, they give and take, they sell and buy. Societies and cultures are permanently in contact with each other. Traces of these necessary and also inevitable activities can be directly seen on languages, that people use in executing the activities concerned.

However, Backus sets forth his ‘pure vision’ with regard to mixing issues. He argues that through contact, speakers mix languages; syntactic constraints, triggering and other processes bring about certain mixing patterns: “…Under the right sociolinguistic conditions these patterns stabilize so that we get a mixed language; under other conditions bilingualism may be maintained with the two languages in a relationship which is to some degree diglossic…” (Backus, 1996: 36). Why are the conditions ‘right’, when a mixed language comes into being and why are conditions in the qualification ‘other’, when two languages are in a diglossic relationship with one another maintaining the ‘bilingual**ism**’? Recall my discussion in the previous section regarding the term ‘bilingual**ism**’ referring to an ideology rather than to the description of a natural phenomenon.

This artificial vision line perpetuates itself with regard to ‘the right circumstances’ for a CS lect to develop into a mixed language in combination with a citation from McConvell: “… Children need to internalize adult CS speech which they receive as input and then there should be forces at work that promote isolation as a separate social group. Such a group often needs a language of its own. Many languages may be mixed, but formed such a long time ago that we have no way of reconstructing their emergence (Backus, 1996: 36-37). Somehow we have to admit that languages are in any case mixed. Finding a ‘pure’, ‘immaculate’, ‘isolated’ langugae on earth is as a difficult job as detecting a precious pearl in a deep and endless ocean. You can take into account for instance my argumentation above concerning the percentage of loan words in English. ‘The right circumstances’ mentioned by Backus seem to relate to artificial laboratorium conditions, under which a mixed language can develop. Albeit reminding readers of the formation of pidgin and creol cases, forces that oblige individuals and groups to live isolated and separate drive us again to the idea that there should be forces at work under ‘special laboratorium conditions’. Therefore, the line of contemplation may sound preposterous, as it all creates a continuum within a dichotomy of ‘pure’ and ‘mixed’ language. To my view, ‘pure language’ at one end of this dichotomy forms absolutely an entropy, which is really hard to find in the real world. And that puts the whole discussion of Backus on a slippery ground.

The discussion of Backus regarding a general distinction between insertion and alternation disqualifies the dichotomy pure-mixed. Single word and multiword switches imply that we cannot speak anymore of so-called ‘pure’ languages. This way or another, languages get in contact and mixed. When it is assumed that insertion and alternation are two different and separate processes, the occurrence of a foreign word in a sentence with regard to CS constraints becomes irrelevant, if that word is a borrowing (Backus, 1996, p. 65).

However, if insertion and alternation are sequential processes of one executive system, then the assertion concerning a ‘pure’ language falls again. Maybe borrowing is the first structural phase

of CS phenomena. L1 remains the base language or ML, while we get some necessary elements (words/phrases) from L2 or EL during the speech in the form of an insertion. If units, which are imported from the L2 or EL get bigger and wider, then we may be close to language switching. In all cases, the main activated language is the ML or L1, while some element or units are occasionally imported from the EL or L2 (or inserted from EL into ML). If EL islands get wider and bigger in the ML discourse, then we may speak of language shift i.e. alternation, which means that ML or L1 gets weaker.

This view explains much better how CS occurs in an immigrant speech. Immigrant groups use only L1 or ML with one another. In the ongoing talk, some missing concepts are retrieved and inserted (transferred) from L2 into L1 (or from EL into ML), while one system (i.e. ML) is open and activated. When insertion is getting wider and concerns bigger units, then two systems get activated and open, which makes the two systems ready for alternatively use. This makes the whole linguistic operation ready for alternation. This explains the case better because immigrants use mainly L1 or ML in in-group communication. However, when these immigrants get in touch with autochtonous people, they have no other choice than using L2 or EL, because their speech partner has access only to L2 or EL. Thus, there is no use for CS. Only EL or L2 is then in use. CS is a typical feature of an immigrant speech community. During in-group communication, ML or L1 is mainly the only language choice. EL comes in action as facilitator only when there are structural or conceptual gaps in the discourse, which borrows the missing parts from EL.

3.1.Intrasentential Codeswitching

There are mainly 3 approaches with regard to discovering possible points for switching: Poplack, Myers-Scotton and Johanson. In the first approach (Poplack's interpretation), the central idea is related to equivalence (constraint). If surface structures of the two languages in contact are similar, CS is possible. If not, CS is dismissed (Poplack, 1980), e.g. Spanish-English bilinguals tended to avoid switching at sites in a sentence, where the languages differed in syntax.

Most single-word switches are the result of a process, fundamentally different from multiword producing processes. Single-word occurs as insertion or borrowing (only the base language is spoken). Multiword use is an alternation, which comes down to a real switch to the other language (Poplack *et al.*, 1988). EL insertions are always content words, nouns most of the time and mostly morphologically simple. More elaborate 'words' e.g. compounds, collocations or idioms can also be inserted as well (Backus, 1996, p. 72).

Myers-Scotton discusses an example coming from young adult Turkish immigrants to Norway. All had lived in Norway for at least four years. The example has instances of Norwegian nouns with affixes that correspond to Turkish well-formedness conditions. That is, Turkish as the Matrix Language sets the frame. From the vantage point of the Matrix Language – Embedded Language opposition, it is interesting to see that nominal constructions (herkes-in *oppgave*-si – everybody his own duty / everybody's duty) are obeying Turkish morphosyntactic rules completely. The head noun comes from Norwegian, but it has the Turkish possessive marker on it (Myers-Scotton, 2010: 90-98).

Example 1: **kjøkken**-de herkesin **oppgave**-si vard-dı

Kitchen-LOC everybody-GEN duty-POSS exist-PST-3SGL

'Everybody has his own duty in the kitchen'

(Turkish/Norwegian; taken from Türker, 2000, p. 151)

Example 1 contains a typical intrasentential codeswitching. Turkish functions as the matrix language, which provides system morphemes (or bound morphemes), whilst Norwegian lends

content morphemes (or free morphemes) to the same sentence. This example seems to confirm the system-content morpheme distinction.

Example 2: bunlar herkes kendi **prijs** söyl-üyor
These everybody self price say-PROG-3SGL
'Everybody says his own price for these'
(Turkish/Dutch; taken from Backus, 1996, p. 109)

Example 2 contains a bare form (*prijs* / price) from the Embedded Language (i.e. Dutch) in a Turkish/Dutch intrasentential codeswitching. Myers-Scotton argues that the content morpheme *prijs* from the EL occurs without the case suffix that would make it well-formed in the ML i.e. Turkish. According to her, to be well-formed in Turkish, the Dutch noun should have a possessive third person singular suffix because of the reflexive that precedes it. Also, because of the possessive, which makes it specific/definite, it needs an accusative suffix, too. Thus, *prijs-i-ni* is expected. She goes on with her argumentation with regard to the accession of the content morpheme *prijs* at all. The claim is that it is selected because it better conveys the speaker's intentions than the Turkish counterpart *fiyat* when the subject is how business is conducted in the Netherlands (Myers-Scotton, 2010, p. 98).

However, the discrepancy of the bare form in this case is, to my view, open to discussion. In a monolingual setting, when the subject is business and price definition, the related content morpheme can be set in nominativus and indefinite modus. Because the flow of the discourse requires a general statement, in which prices are determined for some articles by some some people. Thus, there is a general tendency of talking about unspecific things and the determination of their prices. This case could have yielded an output such as: *bunlar için herkes kendi bir fiyat söylüyor* (Everybody says a price for these). In this output, the object *fiyat* shoul remain in the bare form. We should take also into account the absence of the postposition *için* in the related phrase. This kind of codeswitching may therefore be well-formed with regard to bilingual embedding operation, but may be a deviant one from the monolingual perspective, as the postposition (*ilgeç*) *için* is missing. Now it is a crucial question that bilingual lexicon transforms the monolingual use of the two languages that are to some extent active in bilingual performance. It is as if bilingual use was a point where there is no more turning to monolingual competence. Balanced bilingual cases can be seen in settings where there is continuously sufficient input from the two languages. If there is not enough linguistic feeding in one language, then the two languages in the bilingual lexicon make up a new structuring, which may lead to a new grammar formation. This restructuring seems to give us the picture of ontogenesis of pidgin and creol.

Example 3: **ja, maar toch,** millet **kijken** yapıyor
yeah, but still, everybody watch-INF do-PROG/3SGL
'yeah, but still, everybody is watching you.'
(Turkish/Dutch; taken from Backus, 1996, p. 238)

Example 3 contains an output form which requires any morphosyntactic operation for the EL (i.e. Dutch). This obligation is set by the ML (i.e. Turkish). This is what makes it a bare form from the standpoint of the ML Frame. A non-finite verb (in infinitive form) occurs as a nominalization in the EL in combination with the 'do' construction in the ML. Thus, a verb phrase in a codeswitching consists of a compoundlike construction, of which the non-finite part comes from the EL and the finite or inflected part from the ML (Myers-Scotton, 2010, p. 134). This example shows the grammatical awareness of speakers with regard to the noun-verb distinction. As a result of this, 'do' constructions occur in order to integrate new verbal concepts

into the ML. In other words, verbal categories get nominalized first to be able to form a verb phrase, just like it is the case with borrowings in monolingual use.

4.Myers-Scotton and some counter examples

The second approach comes from Myers-Scotton who argued in her MLF model that there are counter codeswitching examples with regard to Poplack's prognosis in the previous section. They contain single-word switches, which were morphosyntactically embedded into ML utterances:

Example 4: *throwt*
throw-PRES-3SGL
'throws'
Dutch-English CS (De Houwer, 1990, p. 110)

Example 4 demonstrates an interesting output, in which a verb in the EL (i.e. English) gets conjugated according to the morphological rules of the ML (i.e. Dutch). This particular combination may be the result of the fact that these two languages show typologically convergence towards each other.

In MLF model, EL content morphemes can be inserted into ML + EL constituents, which have ML morpheme order and in which all the active system morphemes are from the ML as well. Total integration is not necessary, because **compromise strategies** such as **bare forms** are available. If there is a lack of congruence between the selected EL element and its ML counterpart, then **an EL island** can be the outcome of this process. EL islands are completely **in the EL element**. However, they are still framed (schematized) by the ML clause or sometimes by a larger ML constituent.

5.Johanson: Code Copying (CC)

The third approach is **Code copying (CC) model** of Lars Johanson which was primarily to deal with contact-influenced changes involving Turkic languages. CC is basically the insertion of EL elements into ML clauses, which can be also considered as simple borrowings. Global copies are lexical units from the EL (mainly single-word units). Structural EL elements such as relativization, syntactic pattern can be selectively used in ML utterances. Mixed copies may contain EL (grammatical) structure. Global copies are usually conducted through bare forms or grammatical integration (for an extensive discussion cf. Johanson, 1993; Backus, 1996).

CC combines monolingual and bilingual interactions into a standart linguistic change framework. CC incorporates synchronic and diachronic language variation into a general model, which considers CS as code interaction, which is a neutral cover term. In CC, copies may be larger than single words; non-lexical material can also be copied, which implicates global copying as larger unit (grammatical interference is not seen in the analysis of other CS models).

Global copying involves all structural aspects of EL. For instance, loan phonology and semantics are combined in solutions as I have mentioned in section 2 concerning 'do' constructions. In standard Turkish *spor* (sport) is replaced with the Dutch or German pronunciation, *spor yap-*. Loan semantics ensures a semantic extension in an ML word. German / Dutch *unter/ onder* (under) means among other things 'among', a meaning not similar with its Turkish equivalent *alt □nda* (under), which is yet used in immigrant Turkish. In loan translation / loan syntax (foreign word order) ML elements are combined so as to render a literal translation of some EL idiom. Johanson gives an example on the basis of German / Dutch *jemanden fragen / iemand vragen* (to ask somebody). Immigrant Turkish developed *bir kimseyi sor-* (a someone ask i.e. to ask somebody with an accusative suffix), which is a copy of German / Dutch word order.

With regard to CC types and global copies, Johanson argues that interactions between the two languages concerned can go beyond phrase boundaries within a sentence. These phenomena make language contact and codeswitching issues much more complicated than they actually appear to be.

Example 5:	*Zum Bahnhof* gittim	*Beri □t-i □rayb'n* yapıyor
	To station went-1sgl	report-ACC write do-3sg
	I went to the station	He is writing the report

Example 5 contains two output forms of Johanson, in which global copies are concerned trespassing phrase boundaries (Johanson, 1993: 14). The ML receives content and system morphemes, all set in morphosyntactic configuration. The prepositional clause in EL with its properly inflected form is copied and mapped onto the verb phrase in the ML. But what the ML verb phrase requires in morphosyntactic sense is missing. In the second output form, again 'do' construction occurs, as writing report in German is taken as one block and is made a compound once again with the auxiliary verb *yap*- in the ML.

Conclusion and discussion

Taking the apparently convincing evidence concerning human language from whereever it comes without referring to any prejudiced approach would put us on a firm scientific ground. We should not pay unnecessary respect to some idea, even if they are lately widely accepted and in trend, without questioning and analyzing it objectively and in detail.

Globally evaluating, **the first approach (Poplack)** is the most conservative and restricted model of CS phenomena, as they normally allow CS in structural equivalence cases or at least borrowing of bare forms without any structural integration.

MLF model of Myers-Scotton is more advanced than Poplack's model in the sense that CS occurs in immigrant home language as base code or matrix or host language, whereas the language of majority (Dutch in our case) functions as invading dominant language, which is embedded into immigrant matrix code i.e. ML (Turkish in our case). However, this model does not take any interaction of the two languages in contact proportionally. ML is a receiving / passive code, whilst EL is an active-aggressive / intruding language.

Johanson's CC model provides an extensive overview and insight into the CS phenomen, as it integrates the missing aspects of the previous two approaches. What is also interesting in CC is that it puts abstract (conceptual) copying next to concrete copying in CS research.

Bilingual perspective focuses on insertion and embedding locations between the two languages concerned, but it does not provide an explanation for deviations in monolingual perspective (see example 2). Imagine we have examined all output forms as random sentences in the ML in monolingual sense and the deviating forms in the EL simply as borrowings, then we could see that bilingual interactions have major impact on the structure of the ML.

'Do' constructions are similar to concept formation with borrowings in monolingual use. This implies that bilingual use is the derivative of monolingual grammatical operations.

Hesitation of Backus has shown us that conventionalization and entrenchment are all foggy issues, which are open to change any minute. In fact, Prins admits also that some new words will persist and some others will vanish for good from the sociolect. The criteria that can be set for 'conventionalization', 'borrowing' and 'entrenchment' will be very useful in solving some fundamental problems regarding conceptual frames of these terms. This uncertainty makes things difficult also for Bakcus, as he is struggling with defining mixed and 'pure' languages. We have seen that finding an unmixed language yields a complete case of entropy. Backus is also having

some difficulties in determining distinction between insertion and alternation, which comes in practice down to borrowing and CS. In this paper, it has been discussed that ML or L1 is permanently activated, when borrowing of lexical single units is at work. When borrowing expands over to bigger units and morphosyntactic elements, then EL or L2 too gets activated, which means an alternation i.e. alternatively use of two languages in utterance production.

Bibliography

Ad, B. (1996). *Two in one. Bilingual speech of Turkish immigrants in the Netherlands* (Doctoral dissertation, Ph. D. thesis. University of Tilburg).

De Houwer, A. (1990). *The acquisition of two languages from birth: A case study*. Cambridge University Press.

Johanson, L. (1993). "Code-copying in Immigrant Turkish" in *Immigrant Languages in Europe*, ed. by Guus Extra & Ludo Verhoeven. Adelaide: Multilingual Matters.

Willem, J. M. L. (1989). *Speaking: From intention to articulation*. MIT Press.

Myers-Scotton, C. (1997). *Duelling languages: Grammatical structure in codeswitching*. Oxford University Press.

Myers-Scotton, C. (2002). *Contact linguistics: Bilingual encounters and grammatical outcomes*. Oxford University Press.

Myers-Scotton, C. (2013). *Multiple Voices: An Introduction to Bilingualism.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Poplack, S. (1980). "Sometimes I'll Start a Sentence in Spanish *y termino espa□ol*: Toward a Typology of Code-Switching" in *Linguistics 18*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Poplack, Shan Poplack, S., Sankoff, D., & Miller, C. (1988). The social correlates and linguistic processes of lexical borrowing and assimilation.

Poplack, S., Sankoff, D., & Miller, C. (1988). The social correlates and linguistic processes of lexical borrowing and assimilation.

Türker, E. (2000). Turkish-Norwegian codeswitching: Evidence from intermediate and second generation Turkish immigrants in Norway.